RFP Questions and Answers Set #3:

215. A.3.6.2 requires Volumes I, II, and IV shall be submitted in separate ringed (or similarly bound) binders. A.3.7.1 requires that -The offeror's proposal shall consist of the following physically separate volumes: Vol I, II, II, IV-. May Offerors submit Vol III in a separate binder (without hardcopy pages) containing the Vol III CD?

Answer: Yes, Offers may submit Volume III in a separate binder containing the Volume III CD.

216. As per A.3.6(a) (3), Volume II will be submitted in Word or as a PDF. This volume contains two exhibits from NASA that are in Excel format. May we convert the Excel tables for tabs 1 and 4 into Word and include them in our document in this manner? If not, how would NASA like them inserted into the file?

Answer: No – for those exhibits, they must be returned in Excel format.

217. Is there a prescribed file naming convention or may offerors use any logical scheme to name files on the required CDs?

Answer: Per A.3.6.(a)(3) The format for each proposal volume shall parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in Section III of this solicitation. Offerors may use any logical scheme to name files as long as it parallels the same format of the solicitation.

218. The computer rack enclosure specification requires 'solid top panel fans'. Our research indicates that computer rack enclosure panels are generally either perforated /mesh, solid, or equipped with fans. The requirement for 'solid top panel fans' appears to be contradictory. Please clarify this specification.

Answer: This was a typo – the word "solid" will be removed, upon release of the next Amendment.

219. The requirement for Network Optimization Support is included in the MMA spreadsheet and Attachment A (technical specifications) but not included in the Group D pricing exhibit (PED) or Attachment B (Mandatory Deliverables). Please confirm that Network Optimization Support is a Mandatory Deliverable or should be included as part of Available Components. Also please indicate whether Network Optimization Support should be priced as a mandatory deliverable.

Answer: This requirement is not priced out as part of the mandatory pricing. It is mandatory to be able to provide it but any pricing will be done through the Available Components.

220.The requirement for Network Optimization Support is included in the MMA spreadsheet and Attachment A (technical specifications) but not included in the Group D pricing exhibit (PED) or Attachment B (Mandatory Deliverables). Please confirm that Network Optimization Support is a Mandatory Deliverable or should be included as part of Available Components. Also please indicate whether Network Optimization Support should be priced as a mandatory deliverable.

Answer: This is a repeat of Question 219.

221. A.1.47. TRADE AGREEMENTS CERTIFICATE 52.225-6 (JAN 2005) requires identification of all proposed end products that are not U.S.-made or designated country end products. Given the large number of Available Component end products likely to be proposed, it is recommended that ?end products? be limited to Mandatory Deliverable items and that Available Components be TAA certified at the delivery order level. Please clarify whether all Available Components must be certified and listed with at time of proposal submission with a listing of all Available Components that are not U.S.-made or designated country end products.

   Answer: See answer to Question 91.

222. Please identify the desired location for signed SF30 in the proposal structure. Can they be included in Volume I-Offer Volume immediately following the SF1449?

   Answer: Yes, please include in your Offer Volume.

223. Please identify the proposal section is referred to with the statement 'This shall be Tab 1 of the Past Performance Volume.' Is Tab 1 of Vol IV INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR and Tab 2 SUMMARY OF DEVIATIONS/EXCEPTIONS (PAST PERFORMANCE PROPOSAL)?

   Answer: Yes.

224. Are the six specified elements to be provided in Volume I to be tabbed (1-6)?

   Answer: There are no tab requirements for Volume I – each Offeror must include all elements under Volume I.

225. The requirement for 6.3.1.d references studio lighting with 750 watt output. The standard of measuring flash output for studio lighting generally refers to "watt seconds" rather than watts. Does a light with 750ws of strobe/flash output meet the requirement?

   Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the RFP has clarified that the requirement is for a 750Watt light bulb.

226. The specifications for 6.1.3.1 High End LAN switches OEM1 and OEM2 in exhibit EMDFD include requirement 6.1.3.1.b for OC3c and/or OC12c which differs from the requirement stated in the RFP and Amendment 2. The addition of this requirement also causes the requirements for 6.1.3.1.c, d, e, f and g to differ between EMDFD, the RFP and Amendment 2. Please provide clarification.

   Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this has been corrected.

227. Ethernet is defined in section 6.1.1.1.1.a as 10/100/1000 UTP. For requirements 6.1.4.2.a and 6.1.4.2.b, the specs are asking for Ethernet and Gigabit Ethernet which would be redundant based on the definition of Ethernet provided in section 6.1.1.1.1.a. Please provide clarification.

   Answer: Where the specifications say "Gigabit Ethernet", it is defining a particular performance minimum.

228. For the item "Wall mountable 46" Wide LED TV, will an Aspect Ratio mode of "Original" be considered to satisfy the requirement for "Set by Program?"

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this requirement has been simplified to state: Multiple aspect ratios including at least 16:9 and 4:3.

229. For item 6.3.2.b (Wall mountable 46? Wide LED TV), to meet the 46-inch diagonal size requirement, may the item have a slightly smaller size (45.9?, for example), still be classified as '46-inch class', and meet the requirement?

   Answer: No. The TV must measure 46 inches or more diagonally.

230. For item '6.3.1.b Professional Digital Single Lens Reflex (SLR) Camera,' regarding the "optional file types / sizes," please confirm that the file types/sizes are optional and that support for them (or lack thereof) will not affect the acceptability of a product.

   Answer: The camera must support all the file types/sizes as options.

231. Reference 6.1.1.1.3.a: IEEE 802.1P/Q establishes the prioritization of MAC-level wired traffic based on Class of Service (COS). If an equivalent Traffic Categorization is desired for wireless traffic, the proper standard is IEEE 802.11e. Although this is only a desirable evaluation factor, no wireless intermediate or end system implements 802.1P/Q. Would NASA please amend this requirement?

   Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the RFP has been modified to indicate the correct standard is 802.11E.

232. Reference 6.1.4.3.1.c and 6.1.4.3.1.c.1. - Is it NASA's intent that the Point-to-Point Protocol be desirable or mandatory requirement? c.1 specifies desirable, but it is nor specified for .c.

   Answer: As stated "Point-to-Point (PPP) Protocol [RFC 1661]" is mandatory; PPP RFC 1332 or subsequent version is desirable.

233. Reference 6.1.4.3.1.d. - Frame Relay Protocols and its LMI Extensions apply only to serial interfaces, yet serial interfaces are desirable only on the network routers [REF. 6.1.4.1.c and 6.1.4.2.c]. As a result, please re-align the Frame Relay Protocol requirements to the desirable evaluation factor.

   Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the RFP has been revised to make 6.1.4.3.1.d. a desirable feature.

234. Reference 6.1.1.1.4 and 6.1.3.1.e and 6.1.4.1 and 6.1.4.2 - While MPLS interfaces are desirable on the high-end LAN switches, REF 6.1.3.1.e, there are no explicit MPLS interface requirements on the network routers Ref 6.1.4.1 and 6.4.1.2 -- where MPLS functionality typically belongs as it relies on routing constructs. Please clarify that all network routers, medium and large, shall support implicitly MPLS and MPLS interfaces as a mandatory requirement iaw Core Network Technology requirements above.

   Answer: The core specifications indicate the required features if an MPLS interface is included in a mandatory product. There is no mandatory requirement for any router to have an MPLS interface.

235. Per Government's answer to question #57, "line item pricing for the drive should be the price of one 36TB drive", is Government intending that the price of one "instance" of 36TB drives be embedded into the solution, or does Government want a separate line item price for this 36TB of drives? If a separate line item, where in PEA.XLS should offerors enter this price?

Answer: See Revised Answer to Question 42 in Q and A Set #2.

236. Reference 6.1.4.1.c. and 6.1.4.2.c. - Please advise if Clear and/or Channelized T1/E1 Interfaces on routers, medium and/or large, will meet the desirable evaluation factor for Serial Interfaces.

Answer: No. These would not be considered as meeting the desirable feature for serial interfaces.

237. Reference 6.1.8.b.2 Circuit Test Equipment - Please clarify the functionality of the desirable Circuit Test Equipment as its scope could be one of datacom, telecom or electrical circuit testing, with functionality applied to either active (lit) or passive (unlit) infrastructures testing.

Answer: This is a desirable item. There are therefore no mandatory requirements / specifications other than that it be a network diagnostic tool for circuit testing.

238. Does an LED monitor meet the minimum mandatory requirements for 5.1.1? Market research indicates that LED technology consumes less energy than LCD technology.

Answer: No. LED technology can be included in the Available Components.

239. We have looked at over 2 dozen 7inch or less tablets and no manufacture has been willing to certify it's TAA compliance standing in writing. We would like to request that the size of the tablet be redefined to 7 inch or larger screen size.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 4, this requirement has been changed to desirable.

240. 5.1. Display Devices -h. RGB video input signal. This bidder believes the request should be for a VGA input instead of ?RGB video input signal?. Please clarify. Typically an RGB input is used to connect video devices like DVD players to televisions while a VGA input is used to connect computer systems to monitors? RGB and VGA are similar, but are not the same or interchangeable. Please advise.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this requirement has been changed to read VGA input.

241. 5.6.1. Ergonomic Mouse-a. Elevated hand support for maximum stress reduction This offerer is not sure what the metric is for 'maximum' and therefore would like to request this requirement be a desirable?

Answer: Due to difficulties in meeting TAA compliance and meeting the ergonomic mice requirements, upon release of Amendment 6 this requirement has been simplified to a basic mouse.

242. 5.6.2. Ergonomic Keyboards -c. Built in Wrist support Please change to desirable. Recent studies have shown wrist support may actually be detrimental to users. This also would allow us to offer a more advanced and robust keyboard.

Answer: Due to difficulties in meeting TAA compliance and meeting the ergonomic keyboard requirements, upon release of Amendment 6 this requirement has been simplified to a basic keyboard.

243. Reference 6.1.3.1.e. - MPLS Circuit Cross-Connect (MPLS CCC) Interfaces are used by L2 switches to label, signal and tunnel their L2 traffic over an MPLS backbone. Typically L2 switches are devoid of the proper BGP/MPLS routing constructs. Please advise if MPLS CCC interfaces on High-End LAN switches will meet the desirable evaluation factor.

Answer: Yes.

244. Section A.5.1. Information Technology from entities owned, directed or subsidized by the Peoples Republic of China. Please clarify the purpose for this Terms and Conditions section. This bidder interprets this clause to mean that bidders can bid products manufactured in the Peoples Republic of China for both Minimum Mandatories and Available Components as long as the manufacturer is not owned, directed, or subsidized by the Peoples Republic of China; AND the product is approved to be purchased by NASA's OCIO as a product that is not harmful to the national defense or other interests of the United States government. Such products must be listed in the table that is provided in the solicitation. Is our interpretation correct?

Answer: The clause requires that the offeror identify any such product. It does not prevent a product from being offered for purchase.

245. Ref. 5.1.2.f "Maximum throw distance of 29 feet". Does a projector with a maximum throw distance greater than 29 feet meet the minimum requirement for this specification?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this requirement has been removed.

246.

I would like to request a change to the Network Diagnostic Tool Specifications.

Network Diagnostic Tool Specs
The following network diagnostic tools are required:

    a.   Portable Hardware based network protocol analyzer such as Fluke Networks Optiview Series II Integrated Network Analyzer

        1.   Seven layer protocol analysis

        2.   Active discovery

        3.   SNMP device analysis

        4.   RMON2 traffic analysis

        5.   optional WAN and wireless monitoring

    b.   The following tools are *desirable:*

        1.   Network sniffer tool

        2.   Circuit test equipment

The previous generation OptiView Series II supported these specifications. The current generation of the product no long has RMON2 Traffic Analysis. (RMON is no longer a current networking toolset)

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this was changed to a generic requirement for traffic analysis.

247. Question 57 and PEA.xlsx - In which CLIN the PEA.xlsx table should the individual 36TB storage solution go? We do not see a line item called "One set of 36TBs Hard Drives".

Answer: See Revised Answer to Question 42 in Q and A Set #2.

248. A.3.8.This section lists Offeror Representations and Certifications and then Offeror Representations and Certifications-Commercial Items (52-212-3); what additional Representations and Certifications are to be completed other than the Commercial Items (52-212-3)?

Answer: No additional Representations and Certifications are required to be completed and submitted.

249. A.3.8. Model Contract- The offeror shall sign four original SF 1449s and return with your offer the model contract (SF 1449, and Parts I and II of this RFP). Question: Do you require 4 or 5 copies of the solicitation, with each copy including Pages 7 through Page 46, or should they also include the Addendums through Page 126?

Answer: Upon release of RFP Amendment 6, section A.3.8 was revised to remove the requirement for submission of the Model Contract.

250. A.3.8. Question: Is it acceptable to duplex print (print on both sides of the paper) to reduce the paper usage, saving resources and the environment?

Answer: Yes, it is acceptable to duplex print; each side will count as individual pages.

251. Please clarify the number of volume sets that are to be submitted. Section A.3.6.(a)(1)states Copies = Original plus four hard copies and two electronic copies (on CD's), but in Section A.3.8. Instructions for Offer Volume, Model Contract - The offeror shall sign four original SF 1449s and return with your offer the model contract (SF 1449, and Parts I and II of this RFP. Are offerors to send 4 or 5 full sets in hard copy plus 2 electronically?

Answer: As stated in RFP Section A.3.6, Offerors are required to Submit One original with original signatures, 4 hard copies, and two electronic copies of Volumes I, II, and IV. Volume III requires two electronic copies to be submitted only.

Section A.3.8 requires the Offeror to submit Four Original Signed SF-1449's included in their offer Volume I.

252. Is the contractor expected to include the Administrative Handling Fee in the unit price of each item they are including in the offer price within the pricing sheet at time of submission? a) If so, when will the exact percentage be provided? b) If not, how will the contractor charge the fee without the contractor showing a unit price on the quote that is higher than the SEWP offer price when item A.1.27.(b) states ?the fee shall not be listed separately on quotes or orders, it must be included within the price of the quoted offerings?

Answer: No. Pricing will be allowed to be adjusted to include the fee after contract award.

253. Referring to paragraphs 3.2.1.1.d.4 and 3.2.1.1.e.5: -each node shall be provided with the following configuration.-Based on the response to question 57 in Q&A Set 1: -Answer: The line item pricing for the drive should be the price of one 36TB drive. The proposed configuration must allow for a drive on each node.-Is it the Government's intent that only one data node and one management node each be configured with a minimum of 36TB of storage and remaining nodes each capable of supporting 36TB of storage or should we configure and price all management and data nodes each with 36TB of storage for a total of 1.3PB (36 * 36TB)?

Answer: See Revised Answer to Question 57 in Q and A Set #2.

254. Referring to paragraph 3.2.2.1.f.7: --each node shall be provided with the following configuration-- Is it the Government's intent that only one data node be configured with a minimum of 14TB of storage and remaining data nodes each capable of supporting 14TB of storage or should we configure and price all data nodes with 14TB of storage for a total of 6.5PB (464 * 14TB)?

Answer: Offerors should configure and price all nodes with 14TB of data for a total of 6.5 PB.

255. Referring to RFP section A.3.14.3: Our understanding is that commercial price data-additional supporting documentation is required for all mandatory items. Is it the Government's intent to also require the same commercial price data-additional supporting documentation for the available components?

Answer: No.

256. Since the VA is a user of SEWP do SDVOSB's need to be CVE verified to be on SEWP?

Answer: See answer to Question 150.

257. Is the word affiliate the same as a teaming member? If yes, then can an SDVOSB submit a proposal as a prime using the past performance of another Small Business that it has a teaming agreement with?

Answer: Past performance will be evaluated for the Prime Offeror only.

258. Does "end of life" refer to end of the date of manufacturer or the date at which a product will no longer be supported?

Answer: The term 'end of life' is not in the SEWP V RFP.

259. Reference: Reps & Certs V. (g) (5) Trade Agreements Certificate. FAR 25.401(a)(1) explicitly waives the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act for acquisitions set aside for small businesses. Please confirm that no TAA certification should be provided at time of proposal submission by small business offerors proposing on the set-aside contracts Category B, Group B and C.

Answer: As stated in the RFP, TAA compliance is required for the mandatory items. As noted in A.1.19. TECHNOLOGY REFRESHMENT, TAA compliance for all items on contract will be noted by the TAA flag. This flag will be required after award when the selected companies upload their mandatory and available component offerings.

260. Reference 4.1.c.2 STK T9840D. Oracle seems to be the single source manufacturer for this product. Just prior to the release of the SEWP V RFP, Oracle announced that this product is going out of

production. They state that the last date to place orders for the device will be Nov 30 2013. Since the product will not be commercially available, request that the product specification be either deleted or changed to a current state of the art product.

Answer: See answer to Question 112.

261. It is a significant challenge for small businesses to balance efforts associated with supporting the end of the federal fiscal year buying cycle at the same time they support the significant level of effort associated with producing a quality response to the SEWP V RFP. Small businesses, by definition, are relatively resource constrained and may be unable to sufficiently support the needs of both efforts. Please understand that the end of fiscal year spend is the most critical time for small businesses particularly in the Value Added Reseller segment of the federal IT industry. Making a choice between responding to SEWP and supporting defined agency requirements will, at best, impact the quality of the SEWP responses, and at worst, cause financial pressure on the small businesses that could have a fundamental impact on corporate performance and put jobs at risk. In support of NASA's commitment to small business, will the government please consider extending the due date to the end of October to allow for these types of Offerors to reduce the burden on overtaxed resources?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6 the proposal due date has been changed from November 1, 2013 to November 15, 2013.

262. For item 6.3.1.c "Conference room double bay multimedia lectern with semi-recessed (up to 18 inch) LCD flat panel display", is 18 inches the maximum allowable display size?

Answer: The lectern must accommodate displays up to at least 18 inches. The provided display can be any size that fits in the lectern.

263. Requirement 6.2.6.d states: 'Remote access Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) Virtual private network (VPN) appliance shall be provided which at a minimum: support for web applications including: ActiveX, Java applets, JavaScript, Flash, HTML, JavaScript, VBScript, Web e-mail via Lotus Notes, and Outlook Web Access. Does the Government consider the ability to pass these applications through the VPN as support?

Answer: Yes, the Government considers the ability to pass these applications through the VPN as support.

264. Per the RFP, should requirement 4.2.2.b.1.e in MMB.xls be 4TB/hr rather than 4TB/s?

Answer: Yes, upon release of Amendment 6, the spreadsheet has been updated.

265. In Attachment A Technical Specs section 6.1.2.1 Wireless Access Points, is this section referencing lightweight (controller managed) access points?

Answer: A wireless access point (*WAP*) is a device that allows wireless devices to connect to a wired network using Wi-Fi, or related standards. The proposed product should meet that basic definition and the minimum mandatory requirements.

266. RFP A 6.2.1 All Mandatory Security Tools must meet the following specifications, i.e.; FIPS 140-2, NIAP Common Criteria. Will the government accept products that are currently in process (on track) of obtaining FIPS 140-2 certification or NIAP Common Criteria certification?

Answer: No, the requirement must be met at the time of proposal submission.

267. The instructions call out Section C.1.3.1.3, C.1.5 and C.1.3.1 and the evaluation calls out C.1.3.1.3, C.1.5 and C.1.4.1. Is there a conflict between the instructions and the evaluation criteria? Please clarify?

Answer: See answers to Questions 86 and 110.

268. Tab 7 instructions conflict with Tab 7 evaluation criteria. Please confirm this language (The offeror shall, through a response to Section C.1.3.1. Technical Services, identify how the offeror shall provide software support.) should read Section C.1.4.1 Software Licensing instead of C.1.3.1 Technical Services.

Answer: See answers to Questions 86 and 110.

269. 3.2.1.1.g.1 Racks shall be configured with redundant PDUs. In the PEA document, you have asked for the SmartPDU (Row 11) to be separately identified and priced (with an apparent evaluation qty of 150), while the complete cluster (Row 7) is to be priced (with an apparent evaluation quantity of 160). Please clarify if we are to include the cost of the redundant PDUs (per rack) in Row 7, or if they are only to be included in Row 11? The same question also applies to the High End Cluster.

Answer: The Smart PDUs are separately priced and therefore should not also be priced elsewhere.

270. 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.2.1 For pricing purposes in PEA, you have asked for the switches, KVM, and PDUs to be priced separately. Can you please confirm that these items should NOT be included in the cost of the Mid-Range Cluster (ROW 7), or the High End Cluster (ROW 20), as they would appear to otherwise be priced "Twice" increasing the evaluated cost.

Answer: They should not be included in the price of the clusters.

271. 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.2.1 Confirming that all required CPUs, Memory, Hard Drives, and other critical components for the entire cluster (ROW 7 and ROW 20) need to be included within the selected CLIN. So for example, the 36 Node Mid-Range Cluster should include the cost of 72 Intel Xeon CPUs (2 per node).

Answer: That is correct – except where an item is separately priced in the pricing exhibit, all items should be included in the price of the cluster.

272. For 4.1.c.2 because of the requirement to provide support for STK T9840D/C and STK T10000C/B/A, there is only one manufacturer that can meet this specification. Is NASA aware that the manufacturer charges a fee to become a reseller?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 4, the STK T9840D/C requirement has been removed. To broaden options, the STK T10000C/B/A has been made desirable, per Amendment 6. How Offerors interact in order to respond to a stated mandatory requirement is a business decision for the Offeror to determine.

273. What is the time cutoff for when questions are due to NASA on 9/16/13? No specific time was provided in the RFP.

Answer: 11:59PM ET on 9/16/2013.

274. Please confirm that the acronym list is only to be included in Volume IV Past Performance as indicated in page 132, Section A.3.6, (b) (1) Proposal Content and Page Limitations.

Answer: The list of Acronyms applies to the entire proposal submission. See Amendment#6 Section A.3.6. (PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS item (b).

275. Please clarify the contradiction between page 134, Sections A.3.8 and A.3.9. A.3.8 states that the Gov't does not intend to accept proposals with alternate terms and conditions yet in Section A.3.9 the requirement states that the offeror is to include any new terms, conditions, or clauses that are of benefit to the Gov't and to discuss the benefit to the Gov't in Volumes I, II, III, or IV as appropriate.

Answer: A.3.8 INSTRUCTIONS FOR OFFER VOLUME refers to alternate terms and conditions that deviate from the contract clauses (such as alters, revises, or changes any terms, conditions or clause established under the solicitation),while, A.3.9. SUMMARY OF EXCEPTIONS refers to what the Offeror takes exception to, and also includes any new terms, conditions, or clauses the Offeror wishes to propose that were not included in the Solicitation. Depending on the language, a new term, condition or clause offered may be considered an additional term rather than an "alternative term or condition" that deviates from the contract terms and conditions.

276. Please clarify what volume the Small Business Subcontracting Plan is to be included. page 132, Section A.3.6, (b) (1) Proposal Content and Page Limitations states the SB Plan is to be included in Volume IV Past Performance whereas Section A.3.8, page 133 has the plan included in Volume I Offer Volume.

Answer: Upon release of RFP Amendment 4, A.3.6 has been revised to remove Small Business Subcontracting Plan <u>History</u> from Volume IV Past Performance. In addition, A.3.8 requires the Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan to be submitted in the Volume I Offer Volume.

277. Regarding A.3.15.4, Product Classifications, can NASA offer any guidance on what products should go in which product classifications? In many cases it's clear, but in many others it's not. For example, there is a tab for Video Conferencing Tools? However, most of the items that form a video conferencing system belong to other product classifications: monitors to input/output, cables to cables and wiring, cameras to input/output, telecom to communications, video conferencing software to software, etc. What is left to put in the video conferencing tool tab? Is it acceptable to locate the same item in multiple product classifications? For example, can monitors be located in video conferencing tools, computer systems, and input/output devices? Similarly, can tablets be located in both computer systems and communication devices?

Answer: The offeror has latitude to make the decision as to how they propose their available components in terms of the Product Classifications as long as there is a logical / functional reasoning and the proposed offerings fit within the proposed subcategories.

278. Please confirm that available components are to be submitted only on CD and not hard copy.

Answer: See Section A.3.12.1 Available Components/Instructions- the Available Components list shall be submitted in electronic format only.

279. Regarding RFP section 4.8, Storage Specialists, the minimum mandatory requirements for Group B include an Information Assurance Specialist and a Hardware Engineer. On the MMB spreadsheet there are cells that require descriptions of these positions. Questions: Does NASA want bidders to name these individuals and provide biographical information to prove their qualifications? If so, will NASA consider allowing resumes and specify a page count and where in the proposal they should be located? Or, alternatively, should bidders simply agree to provide the skills outlined in section 4.8 of the RFP?

Answer: A short description should be provided in the MM spreadsheet that indicates the minimum requirement has been met – the MM spreadsheets are used only to ensure mandatory compliance. How much information the offeror wishes to provide on this or any other topic for evaluation in the Management/Technical Approach Proposal is up to the offeror to determine based on the instructions and page limitation.

280. Regarding requirement 3.2.d.1.d.6.a in EMDFA.xls Head Nodes: 40GbE NIC with optics (desirable). Should this requirement be labeled 3.2.2.1.d.6.a and refer to Management Nodes instead of Head Nodes?

Answer: Yes, upon release of Amendment 6, the exhibit has been updated.

281. Regarding A.3.15.4, Product Classifications. The requirement is to assign product classification subgroups to every product we offer. Further, each of these subgroups must have a specific discount associated with it, and that discount may not change over the entire 10-year contract. Unfortunately, there is no relationship between product groups and discounts. Even a subgroup as specific as ?High-end, multifunction Lexmark desktop printer? will have a range of discounts depending on: when in the product lifecycle the item is purchased, promotional strategies of the distributors and OEMs, unpredictable changes in the availability of parts across the international supply chain, and any number of other variables. It is common under SEWP IV for bidders to offer special discounts on specific products on particular RFQs, without redefining the entire product subgroup discount. Is it the intent of NASA to end this practice? If not, are the subgroup discounts still to be considered minimums?

Answer: The proposed discount structure is the minimum discounts. It is only during the proposal stage that offerors must match the proposed discounts with the pricing of available components. Post-award, contract holders can always provide better discounts than the contract minimum.

282. After conducting research on some of the items, were we reached a roadblock in trying to match products with the minimum requirements listed and certain certifications. Of the products researched, most if not all of them match only some, but not all of the given certifications. If possible, would you be able to provide clarity and elaborate (e.g. TAA compliant and 508 Compliant) on these requirements?

Answer: All mandatory items must be TAA compliant per FAR Part 25 and Trade Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 2501, et seq.). Per Section 1.5.1. Section 508 Information, the 508 requirement is met by: "All proposed mandatory products must indicate how applicable 508 requirements are met by either providing a filled in GPAT, VPAT or other supporting documentation." Note that the requirement is to provide the documentation as to how 508 compliance is met, not to ensure 508 compliance, as that is a Government's responsibility.

283. 3.2.1.1. i.3 Shared File System (Desirable) Can you please clarify if you are looking for a Shared File System, where all the data stored on a Management Node (Head) Node is visible to all of the individual data nodes within the cluster, or if you are looking for a distributed/parallel file system, where all of the hard drives within the cluster (including those resident on the data nodes) are available to be managed as one logical pool of storage for the benefit of the entire cluster?

Answer: Any offering that provides for shared files can be proposed as a desirable feature.

284. Would it be possible to provide a sample line item on each page of the Pricing Exhibit Template to clarify the information that is required for submission of the proposal?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, a simple example spreadsheet will be provided.

285. Are SEWP V contract holders allowed to buy on federal contract vehicles per FAR 51.101?

Answer: No. At this time, it is not anticipated that the SEWP V Contracting Officer will authorize contract holders to use Government supply sources. Per FAR 51.101, the Contracting Officer may authorize contract holders to use Government supply sources only under certain types of contracts such as cost reimbursement contracts or contracts under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act.

286. **RFP Reference/Text:** *RFP 6.3.2.c – 42 inch digital signage monitor requirements:*

1. 1080p 9ms panel
2. 16.3mm slim bezel
3. 7 day on/off scheduling
4. Built-in 5Wx2 speaker with 7Wx2 output
5. Remote and panel control lockout
6. RS-232 daisy-chain capable
7. Screen saver/image sticking protection
8. VGA and DVI inputs/outputs for connectivity and control
9. Stand-alone license for a signage software package that delivers program creation, registration, scheduling and distribution of pre-scheduled information.

These requirements point to a specific manufacturer's product that has been discontinued, and the replacement model does not meet these specifications. Please revise the specifications to allow offerors to provide a compliant solution.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 4 to the RFP this requirement has been revised.

287. Section 6.1.1.1.3 Wireless subpar f. - the government has provided the following 'Core Network Technology Specifications' "Support IEEE Standards a/b/g/n". However; the follow-on specificity of Section 6.1.2.1 Wireless Access Points subpart d. calls for "Support of 802.11/a/n/g interfaces". In the order of precedence, is it the governments intent for the individual Product specifications to out weight those generalized under the Core Network Technology Specification?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 4 to the RFP this requirement has been revised.

288. A further request for clarity - Section 6.1.1.1.3 Wireless subpar f. has provided a more extensive specification over that, identified within Section 6.1.2.1 Wireless Access Point subpart d. i.e. "support of 802.11/a/n/g interfaces". Based on the variances stated which would the government deem superior?

Answer: See answer to question 283.

289. **6.3.1.f High-Output Dynamic Vocal Microphone** - The requirements for "Dynamic Range: 140 dB" is outside the range of most microphones and manufacturers within this market segment. Would the Government consider reducing this requirement to "Dynamic Range: 120 dB" putting the requirements in line with industry standards, and allowing for a more open and competitive bidding on this component to be provided to the government.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the specification has been updated to 120 dB.

290. **6.2.6 . Virtual Private Network Appliance** – On requirement "o. Load Balancing Options", is this referring to High Availability (I.E. survive single points of failure in the system)? If not please advise on the expected use case.

Answer: Load balancing is a mechanism by which an appliance can partition requests across multiple servers.

291. Would the Government please confirm that the Customer Evaluations and list of terminated contracts are NOT included in the 10 page limit for the Past Performance Volume as stated in A.3.6 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS (b) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS.

Answer: See Revised Answer to Question 6 in Q and A Set #2.

292. In the final RFP, Section A.3.12.3. Management Plan (Subfactor C) it states…This shall be TAB 8 in the Management/ Technical Approach proposal and requires the Offeror to address how it proposes to handle the **administrative aspects** for SEWP V and it states in…A.4.6.3 Management Plan (Subfactor C). In this subfactor **Program Management and administrative aspects** of the proposal will be evaluated.

Would the government please confirm that we need to address only on the administrative aspects for SEWP V (as they pertain to the overall Program Management) and will be evaluated only on such?

Answer: Upon release of RFP Amendment 6, A.3.12.3 has been amended to state "This shall be TAB 8 in the Management/ Technical Approach proposal and requires the Offeror to address how it proposes to handle the Program Management and administrative aspects for SEWP V.

293. On Minimum Mandatories list, 6.1.3.1, you request as the spec "6.1.3.1.b- 1000BaseSE". Can you please confirm that is indeed intended to be an SE versus SX?

Answer: The RFP correctly states 1000BaseSX.

294. **6.1.9 Network Optimization Support for Core Routing and Switching** – The Government states "the proposed services shall be tied to a specific brand name product." Please clarify if the Government is requesting a specific manufacturer provided resident engineer or if offerors are expected to provide in-house engineers with the relevant certifications.

Answer: The statement does not require the service to be by a manufacturer provided engineer.

295. **6.1.9 Network Optimization Support for Core Routing and Switching** – We request the Government provide additional details on how it envisions the support to be provided. Does the Government intend

for this to be a packaged service or a labor category rate billed regularly (either hourly, weekly, monthly, annually)?

Answer: The manner in which this support will be provided will be determined by the issuing agencies at the delivery order level.

296. **6.1.9 Network Optimization Support for Core Routing and Switching –** As the Government has stated this service includes a "Network Product" Certified Expert, what types of certification or academic qualifications does the Government required for this service?

Answer: There is no minimum requirement for certification.

297. **6.1.9 Network Optimization Support for Core Routing and Switching –** What information does the Government require offerors to provide to validate compliance and competency in the required skill sets?

Answer: The offeror must indicate in Tab 1 (MMD) if their proposed solution meets the requirement. How much information the offeror wishes to provide on this or any other topic for evaluation in the Management/Technical Approach Proposal is up to the offeror to determine based on the instructions and page limitation.

298. 3.2.1.1 h KVM network or connection If we propose a KVM network implementation (rather than a KVM Switch), how should we price the KVM Switch (ROW 13 - PEA)? Your requirements clearly suggest you would prefer a network, as that is the implied implementation for the High end cluster (ROW 28 - PEA). Should we include the cost of both the KVM Appliance and the associated LAN Switches and cables in ROW 13? Additionally, should this cost ALSO be included in ROW 7? It would appear to be priced twice, if we include it in ROW 7. Will you consider revising the description for ROW 13 to read "KVM Implementation with all associated cables/switches to support 36 nodes"?

Answer: Row 13 will be updated to clarify that a full KVM implementation is required. Any items that are separately listed in the pricing exhibit should be excluded from pricing in the associated cluster bundle.

299. Given that this Solicitation calls for a Governmentwide Acquisition Contract as defined in FAR 2.101 ("GWAC") to be awarded, it appears that the phrase "comparable federal contract" contained in Section A.1.7 of this Solicitation means GWAC contracts other than SEWP V held by the Contractor. Can you confirm that this is correct?

Answer: Comparable federal contract is defined as any multiple-award IDIQ contract vehicle that is comparable or similar to the SEWP GWAC.

300. Does the Government intend the solution for requirement 6.1.2.2 to include a hardware based wireless controller as well as a LAN Management package such as Cisco Prime Infrastructure?

Answer: Yes – the requirement specifically calls for a device.

301. Reference 4.5.1.c. Please confirm if the required on line voltage range is + or - 20% (i.e. +/-20%)

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the RFP has been amended to clarify +/- 20%.

302. The table on Page 132 of the RFP, under "Past Performance Volume" lists "Deviations and Exceptions" as Item (c). However, page 141 lists "Deviations and Exceptions" as Item (b).

In our proposal, is it acceptable to provide the Deviations and Exceptions information as Section (c) to coincide with the table on p. 132?

Answer: Yes, that is acceptable.

303. Page 141 does not the list following items shown on page 132 under Item (b), namely Cover Page, Indices, Small Business Subcontracting Plan History, Customer Evaluations, Termination/Descope Information, and List of Acronyms.

Can we assume that the Cover Page listed in item (b), page 132, goes at the beginning of the volume. Please confirm this is correct.

Answer: Yes, that is correct; the cover page would be at the beginning of the Past Performance Volume.

304. The table on Page 132 of the RFP, under "Past Performance Volume" item (b) lists Cover Page, Indices, Small Business Subcontracting Plan History, Customer Evaluations, Termination/Descope Information, and List of Acronyms.

   a. Please clarify "Indices." Is this the same thing as the Table of Contents for the Past Performance Volume? If not, please advise as to the type of information that is to be included in the Indices.

   b. Are all of the sections listed under item (b) mandatory? If not, please confirm which are mandatory and which are discretionary.

   c. Please advise as to where in the past performance volume each of these items should be placed?

 Answer:

   a. **Yes, Indices refers to index or table of contents for the Past Performance Volume.**

   b. **If items in Section (b) are applicable to your submitted Past Performance History, please provide.**

   c. **Create a section to cover these areas.**

305. The table on Page 132 of the RFP, under "Past Performance Volume" item (b) lists Cover Page, Indices, Small Business Subcontracting Plan History, Customer Evaluations, Termination/Descope Information, and List of Acronyms.

As it relates to the Small Business Subcontracting Plan, is NASA looking for subcontracting history on each of the 5 contracts we reference, or our overall history as a company?

Answer: Upon release of RFP Amendment 4, Subcontracting Plan History is no longer a required submission for the Past Performance Volume.

306. The table on Page 132 of the RFP, under "Past Performance Volume" item (b) lists Cover Page, Indices, Small Business Subcontracting Plan History, Customer Evaluations, Termination/Descope Information, and List of Acronyms.

Is the Government looking for Termination/Descope information on the 5 past performances referenced or on the overall history of a company?

Answer: As stated in A.3.13- the Government is looking for Termination/Descope information for the overall company within the past three years.

307. The table on Page 132 of the RFP, under "Past Performance Volume" item (b) lists Cover Page, Indices, Small Business Subcontracting Plan History, Customer Evaluations, Termination/Descope Information, and List of Acronyms. However, there is no mention of a List of Acronyms on page 141.

Should the list of Acronyms be specific to the 5 past performance references or to the proposal as a whole?

Answer: See response to Question # 274 above.

308. Please advise as to where within the Past Performance Volume, the Government wants to have the list of acronyms placed?

Answer: The list of Acronyms should be placed in Volume I (see answer to questions 274).

309. Page 140 of the RFP, A.3.13, 1st sentence, states "This shall be Tab 1 of the Past Performance Volume" but it does not cite what should be in subsequent tabs.
Is it correct to assume that Tab 1 is to include the information listed in (a) Information From the Offeror?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 4 to the RFP all references to TABs in the Past Performance Volume have been removed.

310. Is it acceptable for offerors to use the following system for numbering sections and including Tabs in the Past Performance Volume---namely, is it acceptable to label the tabs Tab 1 for "Information from the Offeror," Tab 2 for "Additional Other Information" (to include the sections listed in item (b) in the table on page 132) and Tab 3, "Deviations and Exceptions?"

Answer: Yes, that is acceptable.

311. If there is a mandatory government numbering system, total number of tabs, and preferred order for the various sections comprising Past Performance Volume, please advise what that system is, how many total tabs, and what the preferred order for all sections mentioned on page 132 and page 140 should be.

Answer: No, there is not a mandatory government numbering system. Offerors should address and appropriately label each element of the Past Performance volume; there may be elements of past performance that apply to some Offerors but not to others.

312. In the RFP Q&A's, Set #1, the answer to Question 6 states that "To answer this question, yes, customer evaluations and list of terminated contracts are not excluded from the 10-page limit in Past Performance." (bold font is the offeror's). However, in item (b) on the Table on page 132 of the RFP, it states that "Customer Evaluations" are excluded from page limitations. (bold font is the offeror's).

Is the RFP correct? Did the Answer to Question 6 contain a typographical error and should it have said that "Customer evaluations and list of terminated contracts are excluded from the 10-page limit on Past Performance"?

Answer: See revised Answer to Question 6- in RFP Questions and Answers #2.

313. In the RFP Q&A's Set #1, Question 41 asks if, for purposes of fidelity, the Government will allow the Offeror to submit images of CPARS and other written customer feedback which may be in text that is other than Times New Roman and smaller than 12 point. The answer to the question was "Yes, however typing can be no less than 10 point."

With the understanding that no original typing that Offerors provide can be smaller than 10 point, please confirm is it acceptable for Offerors to submit images (scans, copies, etc.) for customer evaluations where the font on the customer's original text or original form (CPARS, etc.) is maintained, even if it is smaller than 10 pt., so that Offerors do not have to attempt to alter customer input on those forms by enlarging the font size.

Answer: No, it is not acceptable to submit anything with a font smaller than 10 point. The offeror should not duplicate any government database past performance – as the Government has access to those systems.

314. **Reference: 3.2.3.1** "For this base system, the configuration is for 3 phase power, an input voltage of 220 V and the environment should be considered ideal; i.e. there are no extreme environmental conditions to be considered."

Typical industry standard site power provides 415V 3-phase (wye) and/or 480V 3-phase (delta) for input power to a container solution. This vendor's container ideally is supplied with 415V 3-phase wye for the IT, and 480V 3-phase delta for the DX cooling units. Internal to the container, rack level power distribution units split this power out to the individual IT power plugs and provide 220V single-phase AC to the IT equipment.

Please confirm that a container solution with site power of both 415V and 480V, and supplying 220VAC single-phase to the IT equipment is compliant with this NASA requirement.

Answer: Yes, this is compliant.

315. **5.9.1.1 MFD Monochrome Scanner Functionality; g. SMTP and POP before SMTP authentication**
Will the government consider changing the mandatory requirement for POP to "desirable"? This will allow contractors to broaden the competition for this product.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the reference to POP has been removed.

316. Can you please advise the deadline to submit a proposal to be considered as a Prime Contractor for SEWP V?

Answer: See answer to Question 261.

317. Management/Technical Approach Volume, There are no references to required indices. Is the government referring to the required table of contents? Please define what the government wants offerors to include in indices.

Answer: See RFP Section A.3.7.2 Management/Technical Approach Tab Description. The required Tabs for that Volume are listed there. There is no requirement for indices.

318. Past Performance Volume, There are no references to required indices. Is the government referring to the required table of contents? Please define what the government wants offerors to include in indices.

Answer: See answer to question 304.

319. In order to avoid offerors submitting non compliant proposals, please specify what the government means by the words "folded to eliminate oversize pages"

Answer: Yes, folded to eliminate oversize pages, mean folded to the size of standard 8.5" x 11" paper.

320. Does the statement" folded to eliminate oversize pages" mean that the government will allow 8 1/2" x 14" pages or 8 1/2' x 17" pages if they are folded to a size of 8 1/2" x 11"?

Answer: Yes, that is correct.

321. **A.3.8,** In order to facilitate the submission of compliant proposals, please clarify if the government wants offerors to provide all pages of Parts I and II of the solicitation in the model contract of its proposal (i.e., pages 7 through 128 of the RFP).

Answer: Upon release of RFP Amendment 4, Offerors are no longer required to submit Parts I and II of the solicitation in the model contract of their proposal.

322. **A.3.8,** In order to facilitate the submission of compliant proposals, please clarify what the Government expects offerors to include in the model contract and what elements of Parts I and II of the RFP should be included with proposals.

Answer: See answer to question 321.

323. In order to facilitate the submission of compliant proposals, please clarify if the government is looking for a total of five original signed SF 1449s.

Answer: Yes, and any subsequent RFP Amendments.

324. **A.3.10.3,** Please clarify what the government means by "any reference to documentation.

Answer: "Any reference to documentation" are documents cited in your proposal that were not required in the RFP.

325. A.3.10.3, In order to help evaluators assess the compliance of mandatory minimum requirements, would the government allow offerors to provide an appendix of reference documentation (outside page limitations in soft copy format only) that detail related product specifications?

Answer: No, reference documentation is included in the page limitations.

326. **A.3.13,** Does the government require offerors to submit all of the following - Award Fee Evaluation results, and Fee Determination Official letters, and Annual Performance Evaluation Forms? Gathering all of these artifacts places a substantial burden on vendors and government clients, in part, because not all contracts include these artifacts.

Answer: If applicable to your referenced contracts in the Past Performance Volume, please submit.

327. **A.4.6.1**, Would the government please clarify what it prefers to see versus not see in the narrative description for exceeding the minimum / desirable features? The reference to "a higher value product" seems unclear.

Answer: It varies for each requirement – if the offeror feels they have exceeded a minimum requirement, they should describe how their offering exceeds the minimum.

328. A.1.7, DISCOUNTS FOR TECHNOLOGY EQUIPMENT,Service Restrictions: States the following "the issuing CO pacing an order against the contract is responsible". Suggest replacing the word "pacing" with "placing"?

Answer: Upon the release of Amendment 4, to the SEWP V RFP this has been corrected.

329. A.1.3 and C.1.5, Warranty: Do all mandatory items require an extended warranty? If so, should the extended warranty costs be built in to the total price of each mandatory item?

Answer: Where applicable (the pricing exhibit identifies those items for which warranty is not applicable), the mandatory items must have a warranty package as described in *A.3.14.5.1. Pricing for Extended Warranty.*

330. 1.4.4, States the following "For the purpose of this proposal only, an authorized reseller is defined at a minimum as a company who is known by the OEM and for whom the OEM has approved the proposed mandatory offering(s)".
Is the offeror's approval by an OEM to resell components sufficient, or must the OEM provide approval of proposed configured solution for mandatory offerings?

Answer: The approval must be for the mandatory item.

331. 3.1.f, In Category A, Group A the SEWP V solicitation stipulates that the vendor be an "Authorized" reseller for the mid-range cluster. As organized in the solicitation the mid-range cluster is composed of not only hardware, but also of software (since it appears in Section 3.2.1.3, under the Mid-range cluster section, and is not explicitly specified as upgrade, desirable, or additional technology) , such as AutoDesk Maya and Pixar Renderman. Is it NASA's intention that the vendor be an "Authorized"

reseller for these software application products that run on the mid-range cluster in addition to being an "Authorized" reseller of the mid-range cluster itself. Stated another way, are these Application Software products included within the scope and definition of the mid-range cluster for the purposes of defining what the vendor must be an "Authorized" reseller for?

Answer: As has been previously noted, for the Group A cluster, the offeror must be authorized by the OEM for the computer systems.

332.3.1.4.3, Unlimited Licensing: Is this in reference to Enterprise, site, or per node/processor based upon the operating system chosen?

Answer: Per processor. This has been re-stated.

333.3.2.1.2, Hierarchical Mass Storage System Software: What speed is referenced in the requirement "support access at hard disk storage speed to the most frequently/recently accessed files"?

Answer: There is no specific speed requirement.

334.3.2.1.2.i, Data Archive, Architectural Description, Advanced Technology: Is this requirement to describe the architecture and it would be considered advanced if a mechanical and electrical drawing be provided or is the entire requirement considered optional based upon the definition?

Answer: This is not a requirement – it is an optional discussion as defined in 1.4.3. Minimums / Desirables / Advanced Technology / Additional Technology.

335.3.2.1.3.b.1.i,Please clarify the quantity of Oracle licenses to be quoted. The terms "One New User License", "Per Processor," "Max 4 Sockets," and "Unlimited Use," are confusing in that they are all used in the same sentence. Additionally, there are 464 compute nodes on the mid-range cluster and with no virtualization specified for the mid-range cluster; there is no way of knowing how many cores will be dedicated to the database—a key metric for providing a quote. Are Dual Core processors licensed—as a single processor or two (2)?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the RFP has been amended to clarify that the pricing should be based on an unlimited use license for one data node as proposed by the offeror.

336.3.2.1.3.b.1.i, Oracle Database in reference to Sockets: If the current licensing is regarding cores and not sockets, what configuration should be assumed?

Answer: The RFP has been amended to clarify that the pricing should be based on an unlimited use license for one data node as proposed by the offeror.

337.3.2.2.1.f.1.b.i, Infiniband Blocking: If it is chosen to use devices which change the Infiniband blocking (desirable) for a solution to make it useable in this section and then adds additional hardware to support this choice, will the additional technology need to be priced and included for an otherwise unusable, but mandatory-based system?

Answer: Yes.

338. 3.2.2.1.f.5, Intel Knights Corner: Since f.5 begins with the word "option", should this requirement be treated as "desirable" rather than a "mandatory" requirement?

Answer: No. It means that it is an option that must be allowed for.

339. 3.2.2.1.k.2,Is it required to utilize and supply cable trays? If so, is it also required to supply installation labor for hardware outside of computer support for installation services? Additionally, is it required to specify power location for this 464 node system?

Answer: For purposes of pricing, cable trays should be priced as part of the full solution. The mandatory requirement does not include installation – installation services can be proposed as part of the available components. It is not required to specify power location.

340. **3.2.3.1.1.f.4**,Storage Requirements: Is the device required to support iSCSI, FCoE, NFS, and CIFS simultaneously? How many connections are necessary for iSCSI/FCoE?

Answer: Simultaneous support of iSCSI, FCoE, NFS, and CIFS is not required. The offeror shall propose the connections necessary to meet the requirement in its proposed configuration.

341. **3.2.3.1.2.d.4**,Storage Requirements: Is the device required to support iSCSI, FCoE, NFS, and CIFS simultaneously? How many connections are necessary for iSCSI/FCoE?

Answer: See answer to question 340.

342. **4.1.a.6,** Blu-ray Disk Player—Section 4.1.a.6 specifies a mandatory external hard disk drive. Would proposing an internal hard disk drive be non-compliant? Also, can you shed some light on the purpose of the external hard disk drive, so that we can ensure that the proper applications reside on the Blu-ray Disk Player as well as the right input/output interfaces to make use of it?

Answer: See answer to question 107.

343. **4.2.1.a,**Storage Requirements: Is the device required to support USB, Ultra-SCSI, FC, SATA, eSATA, PCIe, FW, and IB simultaneously?

Answer: No.

344. **4.2.1.f,** Disk Format: What are the required supported file types? i.e., EXT3/4, IFS, NTFS.

Answer: There are no specific requirements for this desirable feature.

345. **4.4,** Bullet 'e' specifies FIPS 140-2 compliance for encryption of data in transit; but Bullet 'f' for encryption of data-at-rest does not—should it?

Answer: That can be defined at the delivery order level (i.e. the RFP is not going to be changed to make this a specific mandatory requirement).

346. **4.5,4.5.1,4.5.2**,What are the input voltage requirements for the small office and small server room UPS?

   a.   How do the input voltage requirements relate to the output?

b.   Does an input voltage of 110/120 VAC have to provide both 110/120VAC and 220/230/240 AC output?

c.   If input voltage is in the 230VAC range do we have to provide an output of 110/120VAC and 220/230/240 VAC?

Answer: See answer to question 58.

347. Mandatory Deliverables doesn't count any of Group A-D's labor categories (Sections 3.3, 4.8, 5.11, and 6.6) as deliverables. Is that intentional?

Answer: Yes that is intentional.

348. **Group B, List of Deliverables,** Transposed the letters in 'HSM Software–1 PB'. It should be 'HMS' for Hierarchical Mass Storage from Section 4.3.

Answer: Upon release of RFP Amendment 6, this has been corrected from HSM to HMS.

349. **C.1.3.4,** States the following "For technology refreshment and contract modifications, at a minimum, the Contractor shall be able to process the following electronic documents".
A numbered list from 1 to 2 is outlined, however only the first item "Technology Refreshment Requests" is provided; is there a second document required?

Answer: No that is a typo that has been corrected upon release of RFP Amendment 4.

350. **C.1.4.4,** States the following "The contractor shall provide all cables, cable connectors and termination needed for installation and operation of the equipment, as a standalone system unless otherwise stated by the Government".

Does the use of the term 'termination' imply services to customize cabling (i.e., terminating fiber or CAT5/6 cabling)?

Answer: Not necessarily. Specific requirements for cabling will be defined at the delivery order level.

351. **C.1.7,** Contractor shall offer installation of all system hardware, system software and cabling." Does this statement mean that the cost of these services should be included in the price of each item?

Answer: No. It means installation shall be offered.

352. **C.2.1 and C.2.2.,** Is an offeror required to provide "all consumable supplies required for full operations of the supplied products" in the price to the customer?

Answer: No – the exact requirements would be defined at the delivery order level.

353. **Section III,** States the following: "Offerors are encouraged to submit multiple offers presenting alternative terms and conditions or commercial items for satisfying the requirements of this solicitation. Each offer will be evaluated separately. However, Section A.3.8 (Para 7) states the following "NOTE: The Government does not intend to accept proposals with alternate terms and conditions". Can the Government clarify?

Answer: See answer to Question 271.

354. **A.3.2,** States the following: "The offeror's proposal shall remain valid for a period of not less than 180 days" and Section III INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS-COMMERCIAL ITEMS Para (c) Period for acceptance of offers states the following: "The offeror agrees to hold the prices in its offer firm for 30 calendar days from the date specified for receipt of offers …". Can the Government clarify that the 180 validity days does not include pricing?

Answer: Read FAR 52.212-1(c) which states the offeror agrees to hold the prices in its offer firm for 30 calendar days from the date specified for receipt of offers unless another time period is specified in an Addendum to the Solicitation. Per A.3.2 Offer Acceptance Period, the proposal shall remain valid for a period of 180 days.

355. **A.3.5**, States the following: "Only one proposal for each group per offeror will be accepted".
Can an offeror holding multiple disadvantaged certifications submit separate proposals in Group B?

Answer: No, as stated in the RFP only one proposal for each group per offeror will be accepted.

356. **A.3.8,** What kind of information is an offeror required to submit to demonstrate its "responsibility"?

Answer: See Section A.4.4 of the RFP and FAR 9.104-1 and 9.104-2. Other than the Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan (For all Other-Than-Small Offerors), there are no special submission requirements.

357. **A.3.12.2,** How should offerors "describe their teaming relationship with other vendors"?

Answer: Explain how you plan to team with other vendors as required in the RFP; SEE C.1.3.6. Manufacturer/Reseller Requirements.

358. **A.3.11.1,** Considering the statement that "Proposals will not be evaluated further and/or considered for award if they do not meet the minimum mandatory specifications" and that the only allowable responses are constrained to Yes or No without explanation (with a No immediately eliminating the vendor from further consideration), has NASA validated that for Groups B, C, and D—a Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) product exists that fully meets all mandatory requirements, including compliance requirements, for each required mandatory item?

Answer: The Draft RFP and RFP have been provided for comments and questions. As part of that process, Industry should inform the Government if there were any minimum mandatory requirements that no product could meet. The RFP will be adjusted based on those comments and questions to attempt to ensure all mandatories are valid. As stated in the RFP, only those proposals for which there are no "N"s in the associated MM exhibit will be evaluated.

359. Pursuant to your RFP Q and A Set 1 published 9/4/13, the Government's response to question 6 contradicts the RFP instructions. Specifically, the question pertained to the Past Performance Volume (A.3.13) and whether or not the customer evaluations and terminated contract information are allowed to be submitted outside of the Information from the Offeror, section A.3.13 (a), and therefore outside of the 10-page limit allotted to that section. The page limitation table on pg 132, section A.3.6 (b), reflects evaluations and termination information is excluded from the page limitation. However, your response

to question 6 states "...To answer this question -- yes, customer evaluations and list of terminated contracts are not excluded from the 10-page limit in Past Performance." Please clarify if your intent was to say they are or are not excluded.

Answer: Please see revised answer #6 at REVISION TO Q and A Set #1, in RFP Q and A Set #2

360. 3.2.1.2. Data archive: Should racks/cabinets be provided? This is in regards to the HSM servers and the disk cache hardware and the SAN switching.

Answer: Yes.

361. 3.2.1.2.e Data archive: The requirement for "Disk cache of 5 Petabytes" - is this raw capacity or usable capacity?

Answer: Raw capacity is what is required.

362. Through market research we have determined that the STK T9840D specified in requirement 4.1.c.2 has reached End of Life status. Bidder requests that this requirement be modified or removed.

Answer: See answer to question 112.

363. The table on page 132 specifies the following to be included in the past performance volume, "(b) Cover Page, Indices, Small Business Subcontracting Plan History, Customer Evaluations, Termination/Descope information, and List of Acronyms." However, A.3.13 does not request the inclusion of a Small Business Subcontracting Plan History. Please clarify.

Answer: See answer to question 276.

364. Please confirm what components are to be included in the price of the 484 node high end cluster. Does the answer to question number 57 of the RFP questions and answers set one apply to the high and cluster as well. Meaning, are we to only price a single 14TB data drive, versus a 14TB data drive for each individual data node within the high end cluster.

Answer: The required storage is to be included in the price. Storage is required for each node.

365. Please confirm our understanding of what components are to be included in the price of the 36-node Mid-Range Cluster . Based on the answer to question number 57 of RFP questions and answers set 1, our understanding is to price only a single 36TB data drive, versus a 36TB data drive for each individual node, though each node in the cluster must support it's own 36TB data drive.

Answer: The required storage is to be included in the price. storage is required for each node.

366. The evaluation criteria states that "a 'no' response to any minimum mandatory specification in Exhibit MMx Minimum Mandatory Specification Matrix indicates a minimum mandatory specification is not met". Please confirm that bidders are to provide an answer of "Yes" in response to EPEAT, Energy Star and Section 508 requirements in Tab 1 even if there are minimum mandatory products that are not applicable to any or all of these requirements. If the above assumption is not correct, please provide guidance on how to respond to these requirements if some or all of the requirements are not applicable since only a Y or N is allowed.

Answer: If all mandatory items for which a specific requirement apply meet that requirement, then a Y should be entered in the column. If any items for which that requirement do not meet the requirement, then an N must be entered.
Note that the RFP has been amended to clarify the 508, EPEAT and Energy Star compliance and applicability:
To meet the 508 compliance, per section 1.5.1. Section 508 Information: "All proposed mandatory products must indicate how applicable 508 requirements are met by either providing a filled-in VPAT, GPAT or other supporting documentation." The requirement is to provide the documentation as to how 508 compliance is met, not to ensure 508 compliance, as that is a Government's responsibility.
To meet EPEAT and Energy Star requirements, per Section 1.6. Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Program: "All proposed mandatory products must meet applicable EPEAT and Energy Star requirements where applicable. For purposes of proposing mandatory products only, these standards will be considered to apply if there are 5 or more products that both meet the associated standard and all other minimum mandatory requirements."

367. Section D.1 says when a MRR or RFQ is issued the Contractor "MUST" respond either...;Does this mean we have to respond to every RFQ in the SEWP on line quoting tool for SEWP V?

    Answer: Contract holders will be required to submit a "No Bid" response as stated in D.1.

368. In 6.3.2.c.2 - Audio Video Monitor and Display Devices - Our research indicates that the specifications for the 42 inch digital signage monitor comply to only a single product that has been discontinued. The replacement product offers a slim bezel of 27.6mm, which is out of the scope of the requirements. We suggest changing the requirement of the slim bezel to the value of this replacement product.

    Answer: See answer to Question 286.

369. A.3.1.4.5 Warranty Pricing - How should extended warranty pricing be addressed in the pricing exhibits when lifetime warranties are offered from the manufacturer that meet the governments warranty requirements?

    Answer: The number of months covered by the warranty is entered in column I. If the number of months is 36 or greater; e.g. lifetime, then enter 36 in that column.

370. A.3.13.a - The Solicitation states that Customer Evaluations are excluded from page limitations (such as multi-page documents like CPARS). Are Offerors able to provide recent customer evaluations as Attachments to the Past Performance Volume?

    Answer: Customer evaluations should be provided in the Past Performance volume.

371. SEWP V Questions and Answers, Set 1, Question 6. The government's response to this question stated that "Customer Evaluations and list of terminated contracts are not excluded from the 10- page limit in the Past Performance Volume." This is a direct conflict with the instructions. Is the government intending to Amend the solicitation Section A.3.6.b.1 to include Customer Evaluations in the page limit. If yes, will the government increase the page limit to allow multiple page CPAR evaluations to be included for each of the 5 maximum references.

Answer: See revised answer to Question 6 on RFP Q and A Set #2.

372. The table on page 132 requires a List of Acronyms in the Past Performance Volume. Is this the only volume that the government is requiring a List of Acronyms?

    Answer: See answer to Questions 274.

373. The table on page 132 requires a List of Acronyms in the Past Performance Volume. Is it the government's intent for the list of Acronyms in the Past Performance Volume to cover acronyms from all volumes?

    Answer: See answer to Questions 274.

374. The table on page 132 requires a List of Acronyms in the Past Performance Volume. Is it the government's intent for Offerors to provide a List of Acronyms within each volume?

    Answer: See answer to Questions 274.

375. Is the 5 PB of disk cache raw or usable capacity?

    Answer: Raw capacity is what is required.

376. EnergyStar.gov has passed a networking certification program on September 3, 2013. please see https://www.energystar.gov/products/specs/small_network_equipment_specification_version_1_0_pd With this requirement so new, the original equipment manufactures have not had the ability to begin any testing or certifications to meet energy star compliance. Will the government consider making this a desirable feature since no products are certified yet?

    Answer: See answer to Question 366.

377. Multiple products are not applicable to EPEAT, energyStar and 508 compliance. Since there is only the option to respond y/n and a no is considered not meeting the minimum mandatories, would the government revise these to be desirable features instead of mandatory features.

    Answer: See answer to Question 366.

378. Requirements for EPEAT certified, Energy Star compliant, 508 compliant and TAA compliant are listed as requirements "where applicable" in the RFP and exhibit MMA.xls. MMB, MMC and MMD exhibits do not specify "where applicable". For example, in MMB.xls, "4.a. All mandatory products are EPEAT certified" implies that all Group B is subject to the EPEAT requirement. Bidder recommends making MMA, MMB, MMC and MMD.xls consistent and/or better defining "where applicable" so as to eliminate any subjective bidder interpretation.

    Answer: See answer to Question 366.

379. Is an LCD flat panel display required to be included with the conference room double bay multimedia lectern (6.3.1.c)?

    Answer: Yes

380.**A.1.10-Time of Delivery**
Q: Will OCONUS orders be classified under Standard Delivery Terms with 30 day delivery expectancy?

Answer: There is no 30 day delivery expectancy. As noted in the RFP, the delivery time is provided at the delivery order level. 30 days is simply a default time if neither the contract holder nor the Government customer request a different time.

381.**A.1.34 NASA 8 Percent Goal**
Q: In addition to those socio economic small business listed in the RFP, can we also use SDVOB's, VOB, and other small businesses to meet the 8% small business goal?

Answer: The requirements of the NASA 8 Percent Goal (1852.219-76) do not require offers to meet a specific goal. The NASA FAR Supplement Clause, NASA 8 Percent Goal (1852.219-76) (JUL 1997) requires Offerors to 'to assist NASA in achieving this goal by using its best efforts to award subcontracts to such entities to the fullest extent consistent with efficient contract performance." The NASA 8 Percent Goal (1852.219-76) states the applicable entities are "small disadvantaged business concerns, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, minority institutions, and women-owned small business concerns".

382.**A.1.34 NASA 8 Percent Goal**
Q: If a prime is responding to more than one category is it NASA's intention to have an 8 percent goal for each category?

Answer: Where Offerors respond with an offer in more than one SEWP V Category, A and/or B, and a contract is awarded, the NASA 8 Percent Goal (1852.219-76) is applicable to each awarded contract.

383.**C.1.5-Warranty**
Q: Can NASA please provide their understanding of mission critical warranty?

Answer: Mission critical would refer to a request to have greater coverage than provided by the extended warranty. The specifics of such coverage would be determined at the delivery order level.

384. In Section III - INSTRUCTIONS, A.3.12.2, for Tab 7 – Post Award Support and Service, the offeror is asked to respond to SOW Sections C.1.3.1.3 – SEWP Technical Support, C.1.5 - Warranty and C.1.3.1 – Technical Services.

However, the Evaluation criteria for Post Award Support and Service specify "the offeror's overall plan for providing the technical support described in the SOW Sections C.1.3.1.3, C.1.5 and C.1.4.1 will be evaluated for effectiveness, completeness and integrated approach……"

Will the Government clarify if the Offeror is to respond to Section C.1.3.1 or C.1.4.1 in Tab 7 – Post Award Support and Service?

Answer: See answer to question 110.

385. If the Government clarifies Question #387 by stating that the Offeror is to respond to Section C.1.3.1 in Tab 7, this question is a follow on.
Section 1.3.1 is comprised of three subsections:

C.1.3.1.1 – Worldwide Web Services – which the offeror is already required to address in Tab 8

C.1.3.1.2 – Systems for Operational Capability Demonstration

C.1.3.1.3 – SEWP Technical Support – which the offeror is already required to address earlier in Tab 7

Where does the Government want each of the three subsections of C.1.3.1 to be addressed in Volume II?

Answer: See answer to question 110.

386. On the recent RFQ, NNG13451284R, section 4.6 deals with the destruction of data, i.e. drives, tapes, etc. I was not sure if this section was up for bid by itself, or if the entire storage section (section 4) had to be submitted on as a package deal.

4.6. Data Destruction Services
As part of cradle to grave options, the following data destruction services must be provided and priced per drive / tape:

    a.   certified e-waste recycler
    b.   on-site hard drive shredding
    c.   on-site tape degaussing

Answer: As stated in A.3.14. INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRICE PROPOSAL VOLUME
There is an ALL or NONE requirement within each group. If an offeror only proposes the partial list of deliverables within a group, that proposal will be excluded from competition and will not be given further consideration, nor will an offeror be given an opportunity to offer pricing for items the offeror may have excluded at the time of proposal submission.

387. In order to increase offerors' ability to provide proposals with more comprehensive product solutions, would the government please extend the proposal deadline to November 1st? This will facilitate gathering data from OEMs and distributors that are engaged in end of fiscal year delivery orders.

Answer: See answer to question 261.

388. For those mandatory items NOT covered by Section 508, does the Government require a statement from the manufacturer that the item proposed is not applicable to the requirements covered by Section 508?

Answer: No.

389. For those mandatory items NOT covered by Section 508, does the Government require a statement from the reseller that the item proposed is not applicable to the requirements covered by Section 508?

Answer: No.

390. For those mandatory items NOT covered by Section 508, does the Government require a statement from both the manufacturer and reseller that the item proposed is not applicable to the requirements covered by Section 508?

Answer: No.

391. For those mandatory items that ARE covered by Section 508 but where a VPAT is not available from the manufacturer, is the Government requesting that the <u>manufacturer,</u> provide a statement that Section 508 is applicable but not available?

Answer: The instructions state: "TAB 1 shall also contain any Section 508 Voluntary Product Accessibility Templates or other supporting documentation as to how the proposed mandatory items meet applicable 508 standards." It is not possible for 508 to be applicable but not available. If 508 is applicable then backup data must be provided that indicates how that compliance is met. This can best be done by a filled out VPAT or the more recent GPAT forms. It is up to the offeror to provide that documentation.

392. For those mandatory items that ARE covered by Section 508 but where a VPAT is not available from the manufacturer, is the Government requesting that <u>the reseller</u> provide a statement that Section 508 is applicable but not available?

Answer: See answer to question 391.

393. For those mandatory items that ARE covered by Section 508 but where a VPAT is not available from the manufacturer, is the Government requesting that <u>both the manufacture and reseller</u> provide a statement that Section 508 is applicable but not available?

Answer: See answer to question 391.

394. In order to provide offerors with a single source for determining the current SEWP V solicitation requirements, would the government please release a set of revised RFP documentation that incorporates all amendments and answers to questions provided to date?

Answer: Yes, at the end of the Question period, once all answers have been provided, the Government will publish a conformed copy of the RFP.

395. Please confirm it is acceptable for an offeror to submit non-TAA compliant hardware as long as it is noted as such in the response.

Answer: All mandatory items must be TAA compliant. If any proposed mandatory item is not TAA compliant, then an N must be placed in the appropriate row of the MM exhibit and the proposal will not be evaluated further.

396. To provide a comprehensive and succinct proposal submission based on any additional guidance and clarification provided in forthcoming SEWP V RFP Questions and Answers, we respectfully request an extension, with the proposal due date to be November 15, 2013.

Answer: See answer to question 261.

397. "The Government's answer to question 38 (with Amendment 3) was ""The labor rate pricing is not part of the mandatory price model. All labor pricing should be provided within the available components.""

If Labor Rate pricing is not part of the mandatory price model, is labor pricing for 6.6 Specialists to be provided under appropriate Product Classification Description Subgroup?"

Answer: Yes-labor pricing can be included as part of the available components.

398. Section 3.2.1.1.d.(1) and 3.2.1.1.e.(1) -- ?Oct-Core Intel 'SandyBridge' 2.3GHz processors' required; 'Oct-Core Intel 'SandyBridge' 2.5GHz processor- desirable: For the Management and Data Nodes in the Mid-Range Cluster, NASA reduced the processor requirement from 2.6GHz to 2.3GHz, indicated that 2.5GHz is desirable, but kept the requirement for 'Oct-core.' There is not a 2.3GHz or 2.5GHz processor in the 8-core category. The Sandy Bridge 2.3GHz E5-2630 and 2.5GHz E5-2640 are 6-core processors. Please clarify if NASA requires a 6-core processor or an 8-core processor.

   Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the following updates have been made: 3.2.1.1.d.1.i (change from 2.3GHz to 2.4GHz) & 3.2.1.1.d.1.i.1 (change from 2.5GHz to 2.6GHz) & 3.2.1.1.e.1.i (change from 2.3GHz to 2.4GHz) & 3.2.1.1.e.1.i.1 (change from 2.5GHz to 2.6GHz) & 3.2.2.1.d.2 (change from 2.3GHz to 2.4GHz) & 3.2.2.1.d.2.b (change from 2.5GHz to 2.6GHz) & 3.2.2.1.e.2 (change from 2.3GHz to 2.4GHz) & 3.2.2.1.e.2.b (change from 2.5GHz to 2.6GHz) & 3.2.2.1.f.4.a (change from 2.3GHz to 2.4GHz) & 3.2.2.1.f.4.a.ii (change from 2.5GHz to 2.6GHz)

399. Section 3.2.2.1.d.(2), 3.2.2.1.e.(2), and 3.2.2.1.f.(4) -- Oct-Core Intel SandyBridge 2.3GHz processors? required; ?Oct-Core Intel 'SandyBridge? 2.5GHz processor? desirable: For the Management, Service, and Compute Nodes in the High-End Cluster, NASA reduced the processor requirement from 2.6GHz to 2.3GHz, indicated that 2.5GHz is desirable, but kept the requirement for ?Oct-core.? There is not a 2.3GHz or 2.5GHz processor in the 8-core category. The Sandy Bridge 2.3GHz E5-2630 and 2.5GHz E5-2640 are 6-core processors. Please clarify if NASA requires a 6-core processor or an 8-core processor.

   Answer: See answer to question 399.

400. Section 3.2.1.1.d.4.a, "minimum of 36 Terabytes of storage for data". Also reference Q&A Set #1 posted with Amendment 3 on 9/4/2013, question #57: "The line item pricing for the drive should be the price of one 36TB drive. The proposed configuration must allow for a drive on each node." Please clarify that NASA intended the line item pricing to be the price of ?36TB of storage? and not ?one 36TB drive.?

   Answer: See Revised Answer to Question 57 in Q and A Set #2

401. Section 3.2.3.1. Hardware Configurations for Container-based Servers, "a. Adiabatic/Ambient cooling (i.e. chiller-free)": Does this mean 100% chiller-free, or that it should operate in that mode whenever outside temperature and humidity allow?

   Answer: The requirement is to be 100% chiller free. The proposed cooling shall address the heat-load of the basic container in Class 3 as well as the equipment in the Class 3/a and Class 3/b requirements.

402. Section 3.2.3.1. Hardware Configurations for Container-based Servers, "c. Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS) capacity shall be sufficient to handle transient (10 seconds or less) power fluctuations and short-term interruptions without disruptions to the equipment in the container:" Does this mean until generator backup sustains the IT load?

   Answer: The UPS should function as required and stated in the specifications for 3a and 3b, as long as it's service is needed. For a sustained interruption, the generator backup would then take-

over for the UPS. Upon release of Amendment 6, the RFP has been clarified: UPS capacity shall support a run-time of a minimum of 30 minutes. The load is only what is required for 3a or 3b.

403. Section 3.2.3.1. Hardware Configurations for Container-based Servers, "d. UPS capacity shall support orderly shutdown of IT equipment and cooling in case of complete (long term) power disruption:" How much time is needed to support an orderly shutdown of IT equipment?

   Answer: Amendment 6 has been revised to indicate a minimum of 30 minutes.

404. Section 3.2.3.1. Hardware Configurations for Container-based Servers, "n. Built-in facility and environmental monitoring and controls." Is this to be an independent system or tied into an existing Building Management System (BMS)? If tied into an existing BMS, what protocol is required?

   Answer: It should be an independent system. Note that this has been changed from a minimum mandatory requirement to an advanced technology (i.e. it should not be part of the priced system).

405. Reference section 3.2.1.1.d.(4)a, Mid-Range Cluster, Management Nodes, "minimum of 36Terabytes of storage for data": Typically, Management Nodes would not have 36 Terabytes of storage. Please clarify if 36 Terabytes of storage are required for the Management Nodes. If this was not intended, please revise the requirement to something more typical for the Management Nodes.

   Answer: The requirement remains as stated.

406. Section 3.2.2.1.f.7(a): The data storage requirement for the High-End Cluster is 14TB of storage on the 464 Compute Nodes and on the 16 Compute Nodes with GPUs. We would have expected 14 TB on the 464 Compute Nodes but not on the 16 Compute Nodes with GPUs. Please revise the requirement to clarify that NASA requires 14TB of storage on the 464 Compute Nodes but not on the 16 Compute Nodes with GPUs, or alternatively, if NASA requires separate storage nodes. Similarly, please clarify that 36TB of storage are desirable on the 464 Compute Nodes but not on the 16 Compute Nodes with GPUs, or alternatively, if NASA desires separate storage nodes.

   Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this requirement has been clarified to indicate that it does not include the 16 GPU nodes.

407. Reference A.3.6(b)(1), table of page limitations. In Q&A Set 1, Question #6, NASA indicated that customer evaluations and list of terminated contracts "are not excluded" from the 10-page limit in Past Performance. Did NASA intend to say that customer evaluations and list of terminated contracts "are excluded" from the 10-page limit for Past Performance?

   Answer: Please see revised answer #6 at REVISION TO Q and A Set #1, in RFP Q and A Set #2.

408. PEA - Problems with protected sheets/cells. Once we enter information into the SOFTWARE Worksheet, we are unable to edit Column A, B, C, D, etc.. Please review the various protection levels and provide a revised PEA.

Answer: Due to various issues encountered in the Classification worksheets, they have been unprotected.   Please note the following:

10/22/2013 7:15 PM

- **Do not alter the contents, formula and/or format of columns E and I.**

- **When pasting into column H, be sure that the format of the column you are copying from is set to "Percent".**

- **If the number of items being proposed exceed 65534 for a particular Classification, you may either:**

    o **Add rows by copying and pasting row 65536 as often as needed**

    o **Create another copy of the entire file and only add data to the Classification tabs where the offerings exceed 65534 items**

409. Many of our suppliers are slow to respond due to the complex nature of the SEWP response and the rush of the Federal buying season. Subsequently, OEMs have been slow to respond to their distributors and distributors in turn slow in responding to VARs. This places small business VARs at a disadvantage. We respectfully request a 3 week extension to the due date, to allow all parties sufficient time to prepare a compelling response while dealing with the added workload of the Federal buying season and the complexity of the SEWP RFP

    Answer: See answer to question 261.

410. Are all draft RFP questions and answers accounted for and incorporated in updates to the final RFP? When will an amendment to the RFP be issued that reflects all answers to questions?

    Answer: Yes, all questions and answers are accounted for with updates to the final RFP. The next amendment #6 will reflect all answers to questions.

411. Previous answers to draft RFP questions stated that all non-TAA compliant equipment must be flagged as such. Guidance for flagging equipment for TAA compliance, Energy Star, EPEAT, and section 508 is detailed in Section A.1.19 of the final RFP. Section A.1.19 covers technical refreshments. The pricing exhibits do not contain any space to flag products with the codes listed in A.1.19. Please clarify whether there is a requirement in the RFP to flag equipment not meeting TAA, Energy Star, EPEAT, or Section 508 compliance. If required, where and how should is this done?

    Answer: This would be done when the awarded contracts upload their initial data into the SEWP database of Record.

412. If a mandatory piece of equipment meets technical specifications, but does not fully meet all compliance standards, which attributes take precedence? For example, is TAA considered of higher value than EPEAT or Energy Star? It is our understanding that EPEAT and Energy Star are of lower precedence with the mandatory technical specifications as top precedence. Where a product meets the mandatory requirements but does not meet the individual requirement completely, how does ?where applicable? apply across all categories?

    Answer: All mandatory requirements must be met – there is no order of precedence. See answer to Question 366 for further clarification.

413. There is only one tablet computer listed as compliant on the EPEAT site. This one tablet does not meet the SEWP minimum mandatory technical specifications for Tablet computer. Are all other tablets considered non-compliant with the minimum mandatory standards? Does the EPEAT requirement apply to Section 5.5.1?

   Answer: See answer to Question 366.

414. For Sections 5.9.1.1.g, 5.9.2.1.h, Category B, Group C ? High volume MFD and Medium volume MFD both call for ?SMTP and POP before SMTP authentication?. Since POP is only used for devices that receive email, the requirement for POP should be removed as a specification for this minimum mandatory to allow the Government a compliant solution.

   Answer: Upon release of RFP Amendment 6, the reference to POP has been removed.

415. Does additional information and guidance disclosed by NASA in the draft RFP Q&A have any precedence with respect to the final RFP? Will an amendment to the RFP be issued that includes the additional information and guidance previously disclosed in the draft RFP?

   Answer: No, information issued to the draft RFP Q&A does not take precedence with respect to the final RFP and any subsequent amendments. No amendment will be issued that includes additional information or previous guidance disclosed in the draft RFP.

416. In C.1.3.4 Electronic Processes, the Government asks that ??the Contractor shall be able to process the following electronic documents:? The list below contains one item, ?1) Technology Refreshment Requests.? Below this line is another bullet, ?2)? with no text beside it. Did the Government intend to include a second item, or is this a misprint?

   Answer: See answer to question 349.

417. Offerors are unable to add any rows to the <Classification> worksheets beyond row 65537 because columns E and I are locked. Could the Government either increase the number of available rows, or provide an unlocked row template for offerors to add as needed?

   Answer: See answer to Question 408.

418. Could the Government please define if the optional keyboard is the software based keyboard used for typing within a tablet environment or an external keyboard that can be used with the tablet?

   Answer: An external keyboard.

419. Could the Government please define if these two requirements require two separate components or if IP enabled motion detectors can satisfy this requirement?

   Answer: The requirement is for a single line item that includes both requirements.

420. Given that prices are being solicited and evaluated against disparate quantities for '36 node mid-range cluster' and some but not all sub-components such as compilers, PDU, switches, KVM, storage and software, offeror is working under the presumption that the price bid for the cluster must include everything required with the exception of these itemized sub-components (compilers, PDU, switches, KVM, storage and software). Is this correct?

Answer: That is correct.

421. Should the price bid for 3.2.1.1.c Smart PDU ? mid-range cluster be for quantity 1? Presumably, multiple PDUs are required to fully configure the mid-range cluster.

    Answer: The pricing should include all the PDUs required to support the proposed mid-range cluster.

422. Should the price bid for 3.2.2.1.g Management Network GbE switch (hi-end cluster) be for quantity 1? Presumably, multiple switches are required to fully configure the hi-end cluster.

    Answer: The pricing should include all the PDUs required to support the proposed mid-range cluster.

423. The current industry standard for this class of projector is for one built in speaker. Requirement is for speakers, implying 2 or more. Can this be clarified?

    Answer: A built-in speaker would meet the requirement.

424. Manufacturers for projection screens state they do not submit these for VPAT compliance due to some of the questions regarding accessibility for VPAT compliance would be determined by the installation of the screens. Can the Government clarify this requirement with respect to this specific solution?

    Answer: See response to Question 366.

425. Current requirement for minimum of 2mm thick original scanning capability limits available OEM to one manufacturer. Can the Government reduce to 0.05 mm for more solution viability?

    Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this requirement has been amended to be a desirable feature.

426. The current state of market solutions do not list anti-glare panel part of configuration for this class of monitor. Would the Government consider removing this requirement for more solution viability?

    Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this requirement has been amended to be a desirable feature.

427. OEMs also differentiate pens by user type (example: teacher/student). Would the Government consider rewording to number of pens required only?

    Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the requirement has been amended to indicate multiple color pens are required.

428. The industry as a whole appears to be moving away from CPU integrated point of sale/cash-handling systems, could the government please consider allowing for a point of sale system that utilizes integrated components but not required integrated CPU?

Answer: The minimum mandatory system will remain as stated. Other forms may be added in the available components.

429. Only one OEM in the market place of this class of MFD is designed with a pre-set/zoom in the range 25-400%. Would the Government please consider simply allowing for enlargement and reduction?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the values 25-400% have been removed.

430. The marketplace for this class of devices often do offer on-board security but only a single brand allows for "Image Overwrite," would the Government please consider opening up this requirement to allow more competitive OEMs?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, image overwrite was changed to a desirable feature.

431. Current technology for this class of printer often has integrated OCR capabilities but does not offer separate OCR software, would the Government please consider simply allowing for OCR as a capability?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the wording has been changed to indicate OCR functionality must be provided without stating how it is provided.

432. SMTP as an MFD feature appears to be industry standard, however technologically POP is an emailing feature to retrieve emails, could the Government please better define this scanning requirement or remove it all together?

Answer: See answer to question 315.

433. MFDs in this class often have RAM below 1GB, would the Government consider allowing for a broader range of possible RAM amounts?

Answer: The requirement will remain as stated.

434. OEMs differentiate fonts and designate scalability. Would the Government consider elaborating on font requirement required for each printer?

Answer: The font requirement for the mandatory items is general without any specific requirements regarding the actual fonts or scalability. As long as the offered products meet the stated requirement, the minimum mandatory has been met.

435. Would the Government please elaborate differentiating characteristic between software supported functionality?

Answer: All information required to meet the minimum mandatories is stated in the RFP. NO further elaboration is planned or required.

436. Having 2 USB ports in a DVR is not an Industry Practice. Will NASA consider changing the quantity of USB ports from 2 to 1 in order to foster competition?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the RFP has been amended to require 1 USB port and to make 2 USB ports desirable.

437.. External hard disk drive - 40GB storage This requirement is applicable only to Gaming Consoles. Will NASA consider changing this requirement to 6. External hard disk drive - 40GB storage (desirable)? Or removing the requirement altogether?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 4, this requirement has been revised to desirable.

438.a. be attachable to USB, Ultra-SCSI, Fibre Channel, SATA, eSATA, PCI Express, FireWire, InfiniBand, or Thunderbolt - Can NASA add 10GBe, iSCSI and other protocols to the list? This would open up competition, therefore increasing savings to the government

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, 10GBe, iSCSI will be added.

439.c. shall be field installable including all necessary cabling and documentation for installation - Can NASA please Clarify what field installable means? Does it mean that the installation will be done by the agency at the agency's location or does it mean that it can be done by the Vendor at the Agency's location?

Answer: It means that as delivered it should be able to be installed by the agency.

440.d. at least 2 RAID devices: - Can NASA please clarify if by at least 2 RAID devices does it mean 2 devices for the blade array and 2 devices for the Scalable RAID, or does it mean 1 device for the Blade array and 1 device for the Scalable RAID?

Answer: There are 2 devices required: a Blade Array (4.2.2.d.1.) and Scalable Raid (4.2.2.d.2).

441.It has become an industry standard to include larger batteries in UPSs in this class size of UPS. They require more time to charge from a full discharge. It is now standard recharged time of <6 hours to (90% after full discharge). Will NASA please either delete this requirement as it is using an outdated measurement or increase the recharge time to <6 hours?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this requirement has been amended to read < 6 hours.

442.C.1.3.1.3. SEWP Technical Support, 3)Continuous adherence to any relevant Government, NASA, and Goddard security requirements - Is this section referring to security requirements for provided warranty services? Could NASA please clarify where relevant security requirements may be found?

Answer: This refers to any relevant security requirements. Specifics would be provided either at the order level or through the contract and any subsequent contract mods.

443.On September 3, 2013, EPA finalized and put into effect an ENERGY STAR specification for Small Network Equipment. As a result, ENERGY STAR is now applicable to multiple Minimum Mandatory products described in Category B, Group D. Manufacturers cannot self-certify to ENERGY STAR. In order to be labeled and marketed as ENERGY STAR certified, independent laboratories recognized by EPA must validate products against specifications. This process can take several months to complete. Currently, no products are certified to the Small Network Equipment specification. At this time and in the near future, responsible bidders cannot represent "All proposed mandatory products must meet the

following (where applicable): b. Energy Star compliant" as directed in the RFP with respect to Category B, Group D. Evaluation criteria states in Section A.4.2 that "failure to meet any of the minimum mandatory specifications will result in the proposal being deemed technically unacceptable, and the propos al will not be given further consideration." With respect to EPEAT and ENERGY STAR, the Government has provided guidance by answering questions, specifically "EPEAT is required wherever it is applicable" and "Energy Star Compliance should be met by those items for which ENERGY STAR compliance is applicable." Because ENERGY STAR compliance is now applicable to Small Network Equipment found in Category B, Group D and no products described by the standard are currently certified, we request the government change the requirement for ENERGY STAR and EPEAT compliance for all products in all Groups from mandatory to "desirable."

Answer: See response to Question 366.

444. Reference section A.3.13 (a), the last two bullets, and Question 6 of RFP Q and A #1 dated 9/4/13. According to A.3.13 (a) last two bullets with regards to recent customer evaluations and contracts terminated, those items "are" excluded from the page limitation. However, according to Question 6 of RFP Q&A set #1 dated 9/4/13, the government response indicates that those two items "are not" excluded from the page limit. There appears to be a conflict, please clarify.

Answer: Please see revised answer #6 at REVISION TO Q and A Set #1, in RFP Q and A Set #2

445. Reference section A.5.1, Page 165, Provision 1852.225-73 and A.1.50, Page 41, Clause 1852.225-74. NASA PIC 13-04 applies Section 516 to FY 2013 appropriations only. The award of SEWP V will not occur until 2014. Therefore, are these Section 516 references applicable to this RFP? If so, the clause and provision both state they apply to NASA Orders only. Therefore, must a contractor identify this information in this RFP submission which is not strictly for NASA SEWP orders? Are we correct to assume this would only be identified at the bid/order level when NASA Agencies request a quote?

Answer: As noted in the RFP, this clause is handled at the delivery order level.

446. In **section 3.2.2.1.f.7**: there is a requirement for 14 Tbyte (36 TB desirable) for *each* of the 464 nodes. Are you really asking for a 6.5 Petabytes (464 x 14 Tbytes) of distributed storage on the cluster?

At 36 Tbytes per node that gives over 17 Petabytes of distributed storage. This is a very un-optimized solution.

(Our recommendation would be for a small local disk on each node (or diskless compute nodes) and a large shared pool of storage (like a lustre filesystem). This is how the large systems at NASA ARC and GSFC are currently configured.)

Answer: The requirement for the minimum mandatory will remain as stated. Other storage products and functionalities may be offered in the Available Components.

447. In section **3.2.3.1.1**. Class 3/a Container-based Computer Systems, it lists the number of nodes as (32) for container 3.a. These 32 nodes could all fit in one rack, yet the RFP has asked for a 20 rack capacity. Can you describe what you intend to put in the other racks so we can better determine the weight requirements for the container?

Answer: In pricing out this requirement, it can be assumed that only the mandatory items will be placed in the container.

448. Requirement **3.2.2.1.f.3** (High-end cluster "cooling for full utilization.."). We believe the RFP has not provided sufficient information to architect a solution and provide accurate and meaningful pricing. In Data Centers, IT cooling in generally provided in two ways: Cool airflow from CRAC (Computer Room Air Conditioner) units or heat exchanges that typically used chilled water in radiator doors at the back of each rack . Virtually all data centers employ some form of CRAC cooling so heat exchange solutions are considered "in addition to" or supplemental cooling.

How much supplemental cooling need greatly depends on:
- The current power load and cooling capability of the data center (before the HPC cluster is deployed)
- The input air temperature and air flow rate (in CFM) to the computer racks
- Power Density of the additional Compute systems (Kilowatts/rack)
- Availability, temperature and flow rate of chilled water

For example, most standard data centers are designed to air cool racks in the 10 KW/rack range. If there is unused cooling capacity in the CRAC units, supplemental cooling is not needed for HPC Racks with power densities under 10 KW/Rack. Also many modern HPC data centers are designed to go much higher.

Can SEWP/NASA provide specific requirements (in KW/rack) for "air-cooled only solution" ?

Answer: In this solution, vendors are required to provide a cooling solution along with their proposed cluster configuration. The proposed cooling solution must take away the vast majority (>95%) of the heat generated by the cluster either through the use of rear door heat exchangers or through an alternative cooling method. Vendors must rely on the existing cooling solution within the data center for only a small amount of residual heat (less than 5%) that is not removed by the vendor solution and humidity control.

449. Can we propose a air-cooled-only solution at 10 KW/rack? (or the answer to Q3.a). There is no requirement on the number of racks the high-end cluster uses. A "less dense" (more racks) solution should not require supplemental cooling.

Answer: Yes, an air-cooled solution can be proposed as long as the vendor includes the necessary equipment to remove the heat generated by the cluster. Vendors must rely on the existing cooling solution within the data center for only a small amount of residual heat (less than 5%) that is not removed by the vendor solution and humidity control.

450. If heat exchangers are required, can SEWP/NASA provide specific requirements or expectations for heat removed (KW/rack heat removed) by a heat exchange solution?

Answer: It is up to the offeror to determine if they need to propose heat exchangers in order to meet the mandatory requirements and support the overall proposed solution.

451. Can SEWP/NASA provide water input temperature and flow rate (as these are critical to the design of a heat exchange system)?

Answer: The offeror can assume that chilled water is at 43-45 degrees Fahrenheit temperature with a flow rate of 900 gallons per minute. However, the proposed solution should not assume direct use of the facility chilled water. Offerors may propose solutions that indirectly exchange the heat from the equipment with the facility chilled water.

452. Additionally, depending on the location facility and the location/source of chilled water, the cost of installing and plumbing heat exchanging technology can be as much or more than cost of the actual doors (hence doubling the solution costs).

    Does SEWP/NASA intend on installing the heat exchanging solution themselves?

    Answer: Installation is not part of the minimum mandatory requirements.

453. 6.1.6.1. VOIP SoftPhones/Software - Please clarify if you are seeking an actual Softphone product to be included in the proposed solution cost, or if the requirement is that the proposed solution VoIP solution (6.1.6) be able to support a softphone

    Answer: This is not a minimum mandatory requirement – it is noted as advanced technology.

454. Section 4.2.2 Multiple Storage Device Requirements, item d, p. 74: Item d. on p. 74 requires "at least 2 RAID devices." Please clarify if NASA is looking for two storage devices, one that supports RAID level 0, 1, 5 and 6 (blade array), and one that supports RAID level 5.

    Answer: There are two separate requirements and products.

455. 6.1.6 e. The differences between the RFP and the MM document make it unclear if NASA is looking for a solution with 25,000 users, or if the solution must be able to scale to this number. Though the difference in wording is slight, there is significant cost differences between a scalable solution and a flat 25,000 seat requirement.

    Answer: This has been changed to a desirable feature. As long as the basic requirements of this section are met and offered in the available components, then the desirable feature will be met.

456. 6.1.6.e. Please provide both the number of users required, and the number the solution must be scalable to as these are two different requirements.

    Answer: This has been changed to a desirable feature. As long as the basic requirements of this section are met and offered in the available components, then the desirable feature will be met.

457. 6.1.6 We ask for clarification on what specifications need to be included in the actual solution, and which requirements must the solution be able to be scaled to. There are a number of these discrepancies between the RFP section and the MMD document which would greatly effect the proposed solution.

    6.1.6.j. Please clarify if the solution needs to actually include these features, or if it should be able to support the listed features, if a customer wanted these as part of their VoIP solution

    Answer: This has been changed to a desirable feature. As long as the basic requirements of this section are met and offered in the available components, then the desirable feature will be met.

458. Section 6.2.3, Anti-spyware Software: Is the Anti-spyware Software applicable to the system level or the network environment level?

    Answer: System level.

459. Section 6.2.4, Server Level Intrusion Protection and Detection Software: Is the Server Level Intrusion Protection and Detection Software applicable to the server physical level or the server software level?

    Answer: It is applicable to both the physical and software level.

460. 3.1.4.1. We would like to note this operating system requirement is not included in the MMA exhibit, we request a modification of the form to allow us to identify the type, as required by the RFP section.

    Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, 3.2.1. Operating System has been added to the MMA exhibit.

461. 6.3.1.d. Please provide additional clarification if respondents should propose a single strobe light which includes 750 watts of high impact strobe, or rather a complete lighting kit (lights, stands, transmitter, and receiver)?

    Answer: See Response to Question 225.

462. Should the system include all hardware (servers, cabling, phones, jacks, etc.) and software to support 25,000 users, or is NASA looking for only the base system be scalable to 25,000 users?

    Answer: This has been changed to a desirable feature. As long as the basic requirements of this section are met and offered in the available components, then the desirable feature will be met.

463. For requirements 6.3.2.d.6.a, b and c will software titles other than those specifically listed, containing similar functionality, be considered compliant?

    Answer: These are not titles. A touch screen keyboard, plus lock down and remote access software must be provided.

464. Is the hardware to run the IP Telephony platform required to be included for requirement 6.1.6?

    Answer: This has been changed to a desirable feature. As long as the basic requirements of this section are met and offered in the available components, then the desirable feature will be met.

465. The requirement for a 16.3mm slim bezel (requirement 6.3.2.c.2) appears to refer to a single OEM's product which our market research indicates has been discontinued or has reached End of Life. In the interest of opening up competition, will the Government revise this requirement to declare a maximum acceptable bezel width?

    Answer: See response to Question 286.

466. For requirement 6.3.1.b.4 are file sizes that are larger than those listed in the RFP considered to exceed the requirement?

Answer: No – exceeding the number /types of files would exceed the minimum.

467. For requirement 6.3.1.b.4 are file sizes that are smaller than those listed in the RFP considered to exceed the requirement?

   Answer: No – exceeding the number /types of files would exceed the minimum.

468. Some of the "focusing modes" listed in requirement 6.3.1.b.8 use names used by a specific OEM. In the interest of increasing competition, will focusing modes named differently from those listed on the requirements, but providing similar functionality, be deemed technically acceptable?

   Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the requirement was restated to state that focusing modes are required without listing camera specific modes.

469. Will the Government consider exposure modes named differently, but providing similar functionality, as a compliant alternative to "Program AE" for requirement 6.3.1.b.9?

   Answer: The requirement was restated to state that focusing modes are required without listing camera specific modes.

470. E-TTL II listed as a requirement in 6.3.1.b.9 is a proprietary mechanism developed by a single OEM. Will the Government consider revising the RFP to require only a "light metering technology for flash" as a compliant alternative?

   Answer: See Response to Question 469.

471. Bidder is not able to locate a Color Large-Format Plotter for requirement 5.3.1.a.3 with a standard bin holding at least up to 50 E/A0-size prints. Will the government consider removing the requirement for standard bin holding at least up to 50 E/A0-size prints?

   Answer: Upon release of Amendment 4, this has been changed to a desirable feature.

472. Bidder is unable to find a compliant Color Printer for requirement 5.2.1.3. Will Government consider changing requirement 5.2.1.3.f "support paper sizes from 3?x5? to 8.5?x14? (legal)" to "support paper sizes from 3.5" x 5 to 8.5?x14? (legal)" in order to create competition for this requirement?

   Answer: This was a typo. Upon release of Amendment 6, this has been amended to state 3.5x5.

473. Does a maximum throw distance of greater than 29 feet meet the minimum mandatory for requirement 5.1.2.f?

   Answer: See answer to question 245.

474. Bidder is not able to find a compliant UPS for requirement 4.5.1 offering both 110/120 VAC and 220/230/240 VAC. Market research indicates that a UPS will offer either 110/120 VAC or 220/230/240 VAC but not both in the same model. Will Government consider changing requirement 4.5.1.b to "Nominal output voltage of 110/120 VAC or 220/230/240 VAC (user selectable)?

   Answer: See answer to question 58.

475. 5.2.1.3 Color Laser Printer To increase offerings, would NASA SEWP consider lowering the duty cycle of the 30ppm color laser to 120,000?

Answer: No.

476. 5.4.1 High Speed/High Performance Scanner New scan models do not include (older) SCSI technology. Would NASA SEWP consider USB 2.0 only connectivity or including network connectivity as an option?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the SCSI minimum mandatory has been removed.

477. 5.9 Multi-functional Devices Would NASA SEWP consider making Scan to Desktop and Twain scanning optional modules? For departmental class devices which are typically operated in a shared environment, the workflow for pull scanning of a document back to the desktop may not be practical or optimal based on a user's proximity to the device.

Answer: The minimum mandatory requirements will remain as stated.

478. This vendor understands and interprets 6.1.9 and 6.1.10 to state that this is for product based engineering services. Does the Government anticipate that these services will be delivered using the specialist described in 6.6 or can this vendor provide additional labor categories, and if so, where should the cost for these additional labor categories be reflected in the Pricing Exhibit?

Answer: Offerors can include a depth and breadth of offerings around product based engineering services in their available components.

479. This vendor understands that under section 6.2 Computer Security Tools that category 6.2.1 Security Tools Core Specification, lists features that all mandatory security tools must meet. Does the Government expect that the specifications identified in 6.2.1 cover 6.2.2, - 6.2.9 only? Is so, in what format would the Government like this to be presented in the response?

Answer: The offeror indicates if the mandatory requirements are met in the MMD exhibit in the rows for those sections.

480. This vendor understands that under 6.3.1.d, Studio lighting, that there are no technical specifications listed, therefore, does the government intend for this vendor to provide standard basic studio lighting?

Answer: Yes.

481. This vendor would like clarification in regards to Section 6.1.9 "the proposed services shall be tied to a specific brand name". Since the pricing worksheet only contains 1 line item for "Network Optimization Support for Core Routing & Switching", can we label that service to include several brands as long as they are specified in the description? If not, specifically how should this be entered into the Pricing Exhibit?

Answer: This service is not part of the mandatory pricing model.

482. The Group (Class) Database tab in Group D's pricing worksheet only has 1 line item for "Network Optimization Support for Core Routing & Switching"; however the minimum mandatory requires 2

OEM solutions in several instances. Can the offering in row 27 (Network Optimization Support for Core Routing & Switching) include multiple brands as long as they are specified? If not, specifically how should this be entered into the Pricing Exhibit?

Answer: This requirement is not directly tied into any one specific product. Offerors can include a depth and breadth of offerings around product based engineering services in their available components.

483. It is not clear whether or not we need to price "Network Optimization Support for Core Routing & Switching" (described in 6.1.9.) since it is listed in Group D's pricing worksheet under the "Group (Class) Database" tab but is not listed as a mandatory deliverable in attachment B under Group D. Does it need to be priced? If so, can it be priced in terms of price per hour? Is the expectation that column G "list Price" will reflect our price therefore column H "Classification Subgroup Discount" is 0%?

Answer: This service is not part of the mandatory pricing model.

484. In Group D's Pricing Exhibit under the "Group (Class) Database" tab, how is column G and H to be used in pricing "Network Optimization Support for Core Routing & Switching"?

Answer: This service is not part of the mandatory pricing model.

485. Can the Government provide a Group D pricing worksheet with sample data submitted in each tab?

Answer: See answer to question 284.

486. Are Specialists, as described in 6.6, a minimum mandatory?

Answer: Yes.

487. Is a price required for Specialists, as described in 6.6? If so, where should the proposal price be submitted?

Answer: No.

488. Is every item listed in the "Class Database" tab in Group D pricing worksheet a minimum mandatory?

Answer: Yes.

489. Are all minimum mandatory items listed in the "Group (Class) Database" tab also listed in the Group D pricing worksheet?

Answer: No. Only those mandatory items for which the pricing model is designed to capture are included.

490. Within the Group D pricing file, should all subcomponents within a minimum mandatory configuration be listed within the appropriate Classification tab? For example, if a "High End LAN switch chassis (OEM 1)" consists of five separate model numbers, should all five model numbers be listed and priced separately within the "Networking Equipment" tab? If so, should the CLIN in column B of the classification worksheet reflect the CLIN used for the master configuration? Using the example already

stated, would all five model numbers reflect the CLIN used for "High End LAN switch chassis (OEM 1)"?

Answer: The Classification Tabs are for Available Components. Subcomponents of mandatory items would be appropriate to include in those tabs.

491. Within the Group D pricing file, should all minimum mandatory items as well as "additional technology" and "available components" be listed and priced within the appropriate classification worksheet/tab?

Answer: The only required items to be listed and priced are in the Group (Class) Database Tab. Additional technology and available components are placed in the appropriate classification tab

492. In reference to the Pricing Exhibit, please elaborate on the instructions for the Product Classifications tab.

Answer: The Government has a lengthy discussion on this tab in the RFP and README file.

493. In reference to the Pricing Exhibit, Would it be possible to provide an example of a filled in Category for the Product Classifications tab?

Answer: A partially filled in sample pricing exhibit is included in Amendment 6.

494. In reference to the Pricing Exhibit, Please clarify/specify the types of subgroups that are to be assigned in the Product Classifications tab.

Answer: Subgroups are fully discussed, with examples, in <u>A.3.15.4. Product Classification Worksheet</u>

495. The subgroup discount that is to be entered into the "Group Database" tab does not appear to be linked to the discount percentage entry on the "Product Classification Page". Please define the subgroup discount that is required to be entered into the "Group Database" tab.

Answer: It is up to the offeror to enter their proposed subgroup and discount. The subgroup must exist in the Product Classification Tab and the discount in the Group Database Tab must be the same or better than the proposed subgroup discount in the Product Classification Tab. So if the offeror proposes under Input/Output a subgroup named "OEM XYZ printers" and proposes a 10% discount for that subgroup; then if an XYZ printer is one of the mandatory items proposed, then in the Group Database, the subgroup would be "OEM XYZ printers" and the discount would need to be 10% or better,

496. Are the individual tabs for the "Available Components" sections intended to be for optional items that we suggest/recommend for the main system(s)? If not, what specific items are to be included in the tab.

Answer: See A.3.12.1 Excellence of Proposed Systems (Subfactor A)/ Available Components / Instructions and section 1.4.3. Minimums / Desirables / Advanced Technology / Additional Technology.

497. Section 6.1.1.1.1.a States that all Ethernet should have 10/100/1000 UTP port base capabilities, is it, therefore, the intention to exclude fiber and 10G ports?

Answer: 10/40/100 Gig and Fiber have been added to the requirement.

498. Section 6.1.3.1.f States that the requirement for High End LAN Switches should have the ability for concurrent configuration of installed interfaced....., What does concurrent configuration mean?

    Answer: Concurrent Configuration of an interface allows repetitive commands to be typed only once and automatically applied to multiple interfaces.

499. In reference to the Pricing Exhibit, in the "Group Database" tab Column B is labeled "Contract Line Item (CLIN)", what specifically needs to be filled into this space? In this instance, is the CLIN the same as the manufacturer's part number or can it be the CLIN number that we are utilizing for our companies internal purposes.

    Answer: See A.3.15.1. Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) Structure.

500. On the pricing sheet, "Group Database" Column F "Classification Description Subgroup" what specific information is required to be entered into this field? Please identify the section of the RFP that provides the specific instructions if they have been provided.

    Answer: This is the corresponding classification description Subgroup proposed in the Product Classification Page.

501. This vendor would like to go with the 53 ft. ISO container. If the UPS is too large to fit into the container along with the 20 IT racks, can we provide UPS in a separate container?

    Answer: Yes. Note that the UPS need only be large enough to handle the proposed minimum mandatory products.

502. This vendor would like to go with the 40 ft. ISO container. If the UPS is too large to fit into the container along with 10 IT racks, can we provide UPS in a separate container?

    Answer: Yes. Note that the UPS need only be large enough to handle the proposed minimum mandatory products.

503. Is water available for the adiabatic system? Or do we need to supply a water tank?

    Answer: For pricing purposes it can be assumed the water is not part of the requirements.

504. In Reference to the Pricing Exhibit, please provide a clear explanation for the requirements for all tabs. Sample information would be helpful in understanding the specific requirements. Are the products that are to be entered those that come from the exceeds tabs for each group?

    Answer: Full information is provided in the RFP and README file.

505. In reference to the Pricing Exhibit for the Group D response, there are tabs that are not applicable to this group (i.e. storage, computer systems). Please explain how we are to tie in the additional tabs required for this group, or is the pricing sheet all-inclusive for the entire contract requirements? If this is the

case, are we advised to leave the tabs blank for that groups that are not specific to the group in which we are responding?

Answer: The tabs are for the available components you want to propose as described in A.3.12.1 Excellence of Proposed Systems (Subfactor A)/ Available Components / Instructions and section 1.4.3. Minimums / Desirables / Advanced Technology / Additional Technology.

506. Regarding 6.1.9 and the statement that "the proposed services shall be tied to a specific brand name", since the pricing worksheet only contains 1 line item for "Network Optimization Support for Core Routing & Switching", can we label that service to include several brands as long as they are specified in the description?

Answer: The current pricing exhibits do not have a line for Network Optimization Support for Core Routing & Switching.

507. In Group D's pricing worksheet under the "Group (Class) Database" tab for line item "Network Optimization Support for Core Routing & Switching", do we submit our price to the government in column G with a 0% entered into column H?

Answer: The current pricing exhibits do not have a line for Network Optimization Support for Core Routing & Switching.

508. Would the Government consider an extension until November 15?

Answer: See answer to question 261.

509. Under Instructions to Offerors- Commercial items (52.212-1) The solicitation states

'(a) North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code and small business size standard. The NAICS code and small business size standard for this acquisition appear in Block 10 of the solicitation cover sheet (SF 1449). However, the small business size standard for a concern which submits an offer in its own name, but which proposes to furnish an item which it did not itself manufacture, is 500 employees.'

 Does this mean that as a SB Offerer we would not need to get a waiver as mentioned further in the solicitation about manufacturer's?

Answer: It is the Agency's Responsibility to obtain a waiver from SBA, based on the government's determination it will not pursue a waiver from SBA to Non-Manufacturing Rule.

510. If we bid in Category D under Full and Open completion as a Small Business would we still be required to provide a SB contracting Plan?

Answer: As stated in the RFP Section A.3.8 Instructions For Offeror Volume "all offerors, that are not small businesses, must submit a Small Business Subcontracting Commercial Plan. Failure to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan shall make the offeror ineligible for award of a contract." Based on this, Small Businesses are not required to provide a small business subcontracting plan.

511. The SF1449 and cover letter has the NAICS 541519 with a size standard of 150 employees. On page 12 of the solicitation it has the NAICS 541519 and when you look that up it states that the size standard is 25.5 mil, Can you confirm which is correct?

Answer: SEWP prescribes (Note 18) for NAICS Code 541519 for Information TechnologyValue Added Resellers which has the size standard of 150 employees.

512. Since the unrestricted on the SF1449 was not marked, what does the full and open completion here mean in regards to all SB (SDVOSB, HUBZone, SB)?

Answer: Set asides are only under Groups B and C Also, see answer to Question 92.

513. Re: 1.4.3. Minimums / Desirables / Advanced Technology / Additional Technology; and
In the RFP document, the Government has defined "advanced technology" to be "Advanced capabilities that provide the Government with significant added benefit." The Government has then defined "advanced capabilities" as being "features that are either at the cutting edge of technology or for which standards (industry or de-facto) are still forming".

In the RFP document, this Offeror is unable to find a specific definition for "emerging technology".

Please define "emerging technology" and clarify the difference between "advanced technology" and "emerging technology".

Answer: Emerging technology is a specific instance of advanced technology – that technology which is still being formed.

514. Re: SOW C.1.3.4 ELECTRONIC PROCESSES
What is the intent of, and what are the required contents of, the "Post Order Reports"?

Answer: See Sections D.5 and D.6 for examples of post-order reports.

515. Re: Attachment D, Section D.2.2 last paragraph
Reference is made to "Section D.1.1. Delivery Order Processing". Please confirm that the reference should be to "Section D.2.1. Delivery Order Processing".

Answer: Yes, that is a typo. Upon release of Amendment 6, this has been corrected.

516. Re: Attachment D, Section D.1, On-Line Quoting
Please explain how the Contractor will be notified that a Market Research Request (MRR) or Request for Quote (RFQ) has been issued in the NASA SEWP On-Line Quote Request system, and please explain how the Contractor will retrieve the MRR or RFQ from that system.

Answer: A Website will be supplied to contract holders to allow them access to RFQs. That process will be described post-contract award.

517. Regarding Requirement 5.2 – Printers
The requirement for these printers state: Support Paper Sizes from 3"x5" to 8.5"x14" (legal). Research indicates that the standard minimum size is 3.5"x 5", and has not yet found a printer meeting the 3" minimum specification. Will NASA consider changing the minimum print size to 3.5" x 5"?

Answer: See Response to Question 472.

518. Past Performance-Please confirm whether there is a requirement to provide a past performance questionnaire using Dun and Bradstreet.

If not required, please confirm whether SEWP PMO will accept the use of D & B past performance?

Answer: A Dun and Bradstreet past performance Questionnaire is not a requirement of the RFP. However, as stated in A.3.13 Past Performance Volume, Recent customer evaluations of past performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, or any other written performance feedback. (Excluded from the page limitation).

519. Deliverables-Will PMO accept fully a electronic(non-printed) response?

Answer: No.

520. Deliverables-Is DVD-ROM acceptable alternative to CD-ROM?

Answer: Yes, DVD-ROM is acceptable.

521. Deliverables-We would like to offer a PDF document with internal links between sections. Would this be acceptable?

Answer: No, that is not acceptable.

522. Technical Comms-Is there guidance available regarding the level of technical detail which should be addressed when responding to technical sections?

Answer: The guidance is what is provided in A.3.

523. Minimum Mandatory-Additional guidance regarding how the minimum mandatory specifications will be evaluated is requested.

In the event that the specifications for a component are close but do not exact match the minimum mandatory specifications, will the item be considered to have met the minimum requirements or do all specifications need to match exactly?

Answer: If an item is close but does not meet the minimum mandatory, an N must be placed in the MM exhibit for that requirement. The proposal will then not be further evaluated.

 Ex: 5.1.1. LCD Display Monitor
Specifications call for a 21" (diagonal) display. If we were to offer a 22" (diagonal) display, with all other specifications matching exactly. Would the device:
Fail to meet the minimum mandatory requirements
OR
Fail to meet the minimum mandatory requirements but be considered to be "exceeding the minimum"
OR
Meet the minimum mandatory requirements?
OR

Other results (Please explain)

EX: 5.2.1.2 Hi-speed laser printer
c. Hi-speed printer: 500mb memory
Are we expected to meet these exact specifications or would a device which has 512mb be acceptable for the minimum mandatory

d. 200,000 pages per month, would a device with 225,000 pages per month
Fail to meet the minimum mandatory requirements
OR
Fail to meet the minimum mandatory requirements but be considered exceeding the minimum
OR
Meet the minimum mandatory requirements?
OR
Other results (Please explain)

Please note, we have been proceeding up to this time by identifying the lowest price item which meets or exceeds all technical specifications.

Answer: If you exceed a minimum, then you have met the minimum requirements and can also note how you have exceeded the minimum in the EMDF exhibit. In all 3 examples, the minimum was met and exceeded.

524. Deliverables-Would the government extend the due date (deadline) for Past Performance Questionnaires beyond the response due date?

Answer: All past performance submissions are due at the time of proposal submission.

525. SEWP PMO-Would the government provide a point of contact for FOIA requests pertaining to this effort?

Answer: All FOIA requests can be emailed to foia@gsfc.nasa.gov.

526. Technical Comms-For EDI interface with the government ordering system(s), what is the preferred response format — SOAP or other XML, RSS/Atom, custom?

Answer: The format for reports is SEWP specific and noted in Attachment D.

527. Technical Comms-What level of encryption is desired for data transmission over SSL, with regard to user credentials (login/password), EDI messages?

Answer: There is no encryption requirement.

528. Technical Comms-Follow-on to previous: should our on-line order system utilize government enterprise authentication systems already in place (Active Directory, LDAP, CAC, PIV, or other such as RSA/Radius, etc.)?

Answer: If an offeror chooses to allow for online ordering (which is limited to orders under the micro-purchase limit of $3000), there are no SEWP contractual requirements beyond the reporting requirements in Section D.

529. Minimum Mandatory-Regarding the following minimum mandatory devices for Group C, can you please confirm the requirement for the devices to include "post office protocol" or POP capability. This protocol is only used to receive emails.

    5.9.1. Hi Volume Mono MFP
        5.9.1.1.g. Hi MFP: SMTP and POP
    5.9.2. Medium Volume Color MFP
        5.9.2.1.h. Color MFP: SMTP and POP

    Answer: This requirement has been removed.

530. Advanced Technology In light of how the term Advanced Technology is used in the RFP, and how it will be used during response evaluation in general, how should "advanced technology" be addressed for Group C responders?

    References in the RFP to in the RFP include:

    1.8. The RFP defines Advanced Technology as: Advanced capabilities that provide the Government with significant added benefit

    1.4.3. It is listed as one of the four categories for technical specifications

    A.4.6.1. Indicates, in part, that proposed technology "...will be evaluated with emphasis on the advanced technology features identified in the Technical Specifications."

    Group C is the only competition group which does not have technical specifications identified as "advanced technology".

    Answer: Offerors may call out that technology in their proposal that they consider to be advanced or otherwise meet the instructions for the technical proposal.

531. Reference: PEA.xls Pricing Spreadsheet, Group Database Worksheet
    Question: Is Cell G7 the sum of all items required to comply with the RFP requirements? Is it inclusive of the individual components identified in PEA Group Database rows 8 through 19?

    Answer: It is inclusive of all items needed to meet the mandatory requirement except for those separately listed.

532. Reference: PEA.xls Pricing Spreadsheet, Group Database Worksheet
    Question: Is the list price for items in rows 8 through 19 single unit list prices (quantity of 1)? Or a sum of the list prices of the total quantity of those components needed to meet the requirements for the mid-range cluster?

    Answer: See responses to Questions 421 and 422.

533. Reference: PEA.xls Pricing Spreadsheet, Group Database Worksheet
Question: What level of detail is required to support the prices in the Group Database worksheet? Is the government expecting vendors to provide full bill of materials for each pricing line (e.g. PEA.xls Group Database rows 7 through 19) in the mandatory configuration? Will the Government advise the vendors where and how to provide this level of detail?

Answer: See <u>A.3.14.3 Required Commercial Price Data.</u>

534. Will we have the opportunity to ask additional questions after the initial 16 September deadline?

Answer: The government does not intend to extend the question deadline date beyond September 16th.

535. A.3.84-"Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan…"-Will you provide a plug number for the Total Contract Value for the Commerical Small Business Subcontracting Plan?

Answer: The total value for SEWP V is $20.0 Billion per awarded contract.

536. RFP, page 47 Addendum 1 - List of Documents, Exhibits, and Other Attachments-Attachment F, Pricing Exhibits, (To be Proposed)-Please clarify what Pricing Exhibits are to be proposed.

Answer: The PE Excel spreadsheet.

537. RFP, page 142-A.3.14.2 - Structure and Content of Price Proposal, paragraph 2-The offeror shall submit all completed price exhibits on a CD ROM in Microsoft Excel 2007. Is Microsoft Excel .xlsx format acceptable?

Answer: Yes.

538. RFP, page 113-C.1.3.2 Program Office Support-The contractor shall staff a program office to support the success of the SEWP contract. Where should contractors include costs for the Program Office Support Staff including TRAVEL costs associated with required meetings and training? Is there a place in the pricing schedule to include PMO costs?

Answer: Any costs in managing the Contract is borne by the offeror.

539. If TRAVEL is required in service repairs or maintenance orders, will TRAVEL COSTS be proposed at time of a quotation request?

Answer: Yes.

540. RFP, page 20 A.1.91.1 - Specialized Contract Line Item Numbers - Item 3) DELIVERY - Z: Delivery Fee. If a DELIVERY FEE is required in RETURNS, service repairs or maintenance orders, will DELIVER FEE COSTS be proposed at time of a quotation request?

Answer: Please see A.1.25. DELIVERY AND OTHER CHARGES. If the return is due to a Government initiated change, then the Government entity would work with the contract holder on the means and cost of any return.

541.RFP, page 24 A.1.27 - Contractor Collection of Agency Administrative Handling Fee An Agency Administrative Handling Fee, not to exceed 3/4 % of the total price of the delivery order.
Please define how this fee percent is to be calculated. Should the percentage be added to the grand total quoted price as a multiplier? For example, ($1,000 x 1.0075 = $1,007.50 total price)

Answer: As stated the fee is owed based on the total order amount exclusive of the fee.

542.Is a contractor allowed to propose Labor Categories on an hourly basis?

Answer: Yes

543.If a contractor wants to propose Labor Categories on an hourly basis where should we enter this pricing information.

Answer: In the appropriate Classification tab; e.g. Installation labor would be in the Installation tab in the Exhibits.

544.Reference: SEWP V RFP NNG13451284R, Solutions for Enterprise-Wide Procurement Section 4.1. Single Storage Devices states, "The following devices must be provided: STK T9840D."
Question/Comment: Oracle has announced that the STK T9840D is going out of production as of 11/30/2013. As this is before the anticipated contract award for SEWP V and no replacement product is planned, can this product be removed from the mandatory list? While used product may be available from time to time availability cannot be guaranteed, which would not be in the best interest of the government. If this requirement isn't removed will used T9840D products be considered acceptable?

Answer: See answer to question 112.

545.Reference: SEWP V RFP NNG13451284R, Solutions for Enterprise-Wide Procurement Section 1.4.4. Authorized Reseller states, "For the purpose of this proposal only, an authorized reseller is defined at a minimum as a company who is known by the OEM and for whom the OEM has approved the proposed mandatory offering(s)."

Does the vendor need to be an Authorized Reseller for the mandatory products at the time of submission or can that be completed by the contract award date? Allowing vendors time to complete the certifications needed to become an Authorized Reseller for certain classes of equipment would increase competition for the solicitation.

Answer: The requirement is for an Offeror to be Authorized Reseller (see also 1.4.4.) for the mandatory products at the time of their proposal submission.

546.Reference: SEWP V RFP NNG13451284R, Solutions for Enterprise-Wide Procurement Section 4.6.a. states, "The following data destruction services must be provided and priced per drive/tape: a. certified e-waste recycler."
Question/Comment: Could you please clarify whose certification is needed for the e-waste recycling?

Answer: There is no minimum certification requirement.

547. Reference: SEWP V RFP NNG13451284R, Solutions for Enterprise-Wide Procurement Section 4.6.a. states, "The following data destruction services must be provided and priced per drive/tape: b. on-site hard drive shredding."
Question/Comment: Could you please clarify if the hard-drive shredding is physical shredding or software-based shredding?

Answer: The hard-drive shredding is physical.

548. RFP Reference: 3.3. Product Based Services Support
To assist in product recommendations, installation, and support of computer systems products the following specialists shall be supported:

Pricing Spreadsheet (Analyst Tab) and table at A. 3.14.6. Pricing for Non-Mandatory Available Components: Analysts

RFP refers to the personnel (Operations Systems Security Specialist, Computer Systems Engineer Applications, Systems Analyst/Programmer) as specialists. Table and Pricing Exhibit refers to Analysts. Where on the Pricing spreadsheet (Group A) are the labor prices for these three labor categories to be provided? On the Analyst tab? If not, what goes on the Analyst tab?

Answer: The analyst tab is for available components that the offeror proposes to provide a full depth and breadth of offerings – in this tab, those available components should be related to Analyst type of products and services. It would be appropriate to include in those available components the labor rates of the analysts that meet the minimum mandatory along with a full suite of similar and diverse offerings in the analyst arena.

549. RFP Reference: 3.2.1.3 Application Software (for mid-range cluster)
Please clarify the requirement for including pricing for RenderMan and AutoDesk (or equivalent) software licenses in Category A. We recognize that the intent is that the cluster is capable of supporting these particular tools, however there are a very limited number of authorized resellers for these products. In addition, as a Category A offeror we do not anticipate offering this software as a part of our catalog should we be awarded a SEWP contract as software licensing is not the core scope of Category A requirements. Per the solicitation, what other products are equivalent? Would the Government please consider offering a plug-number for the pricing of these tools or exclude them by naming the software as not separately priced.

Answer: Software licensing is in the core scope of Group A which is why it is part of the mandatory requirements. The requirement can be met by the noted products or an equivalent product. The pricing should be based on a single user license.

550. RFP Reference: Pricing Exhibit A
The pricing exhibit (line 7) indicates the 36-node cluster "with all cables and racks, OS Drives, storage, etc.", with an evaluation quantity to be filled in. Should offerors price one package containing the 36-node cluster with all cables and racks, or should we price a unit price for one node and fill in quantity as 36? Would the Smart PDU be included or excluded/separated from the 36 node cluster?

Answer: The evaluation quantity is a Government provided and hidden value in the Mandatory Items Tab – this Tab is locked as it is used purely to calculate the pricing based on information provided in the Group Database Tab. You should price the full price of the entire cluster that meets the minimum mandatory requirements including all of the computer systems, storage, racks, cables, etc., except for those items separately listed; i.e. C++ compiler, Fortran Compiler, OS license, Smart PDU, GbE switch, KVM switch.

551. The pricing exhibit also indicates below (line 11) a Smart PDU, which is often packaged as part of the 36-node cluster. Should proposals pull out the price of the Smart PDU to be separate from the 36-node cluster? Same question about the switches (lines 26 and 27). Should proposals pull out the price of the LAN switch and Infiniband Switch to be separate from the 36-node cluster?

    Answer: Yes – if an item is separately listed, its price should not be included in the cluster price.

552. RFP Reference: Pricing Exhibit A and Warranty A.1.14 and C.1.5.3
    A.1.14 WARRANTY "The Contractor shall provide an extended warranty, which can be purchased and begin at any time during the standard commercial warranty period up to and including the end of the commercial warranty period. Extended warranty packages may be invoiced and paid at the start of the warranty period. This extended warranty shall provide coverage based on the standard commercial warranty."

    C.1.5.3. COMMERCIAL WARRANTY "The Contractor shall provide the Government with warranty equivalent to their commercial warranty offerings in terms of response time, principal period of service. In lieu of a commercial warranty, at a minimum, warranty shall be offered in one year increments with the following coverage: five days a week (Monday through Friday) and for eight (8) hours a day during business hours, with a next day response time."

    Some items do not normally include a warranty. For example, a rack typically includes a 3-year limited parts-only warranty. Servers and storage typically are offered with 3-year warranty including onsite support. Is the government seeking for vendors to offer new and different warranties, or to state the existing warranties?

    Answer: See Section <u>A.3.14.5. Warranty Pricing.</u>

553. RFP Reference: Category A: Group A: Class 3/a Container-based Computer Systems (section 3.2.3.1.1)

    Category A: Group A: Class 3/b Container-based Computer Systems (section 3.2.3.1.2)
    Question:
    a.   Class 3a: There is no reference to a requirement for a particular RAID level for the internal storage requirement of the servers in sections 3.2.3.1.1.e.3 and 3.2.3.1.2.c.3. Is there a requirement for RAID support?

    b.   Class 3a: There is no reference to a requirement for Hot-swap capability for the internal storage requirement of the servers in sections 3.2.3.1.1.e.3 and 3.2.3.1.2.c.3. Is there a requirement for Hot-swap capability?

    c.   Class 3b: There is no reference to a requirement for a particular RAID level for the internal storage requirement of the servers in sections 3.2.3.1.1.e.3 and 3.2.3.1.2.c.3. Is there a requirement for RAID support?

    d.   Class 3b: There is no reference to a requirement for Hot-swap capability for the internal storage requirement of the servers in sections 3.2.3.1.1.e.3 and 3.2.3.1.2.c.3. Is there a requirement for Hot-swap capability?

Answer: There is no minimum mandatory requirement for these functionalities.

554. RFP Reference: A.4.6.1. Excellence of Proposed Systems (Subfactor A)
Question: Breadth and depth: we have manufacturers with equipment technology segments (beyond the mandatory) not related to Category A (e.g., displays, telecomm equipment) which may be covered in Categories B-C-D. If we have such equipment available, are offerors to list this equipment to demonstrate breadth/depth in a Category A proposal?

Answer: Yes - that is the definition of breadth of product offerings.

555. RFP Reference: A.4.6.1. Excellence of Proposed Systems (Subfactor A)
Question: What is a technology segment? Are these the categories in the pricing spreadsheet, e.g.,
    a.   Hardware: computer, networking, storage, communication, power, input/output, computer security, cabinets/enclosures, imaging, video conferencing, cable/wiring

    b.   Software: security, data acquisition, documentation

    c.   Hardware, software, maintenance, warranty, product training and firm fixed price services

    d.   Services: documentation, training, analysts, installation, maintenance

Answer: A technology segment is an area of focus; so for a printer manufacture, printing is their technology segment.

556. RFP Reference: Category A: Group A: Class 3/a Container-based Computer Systems (section 3.2.3.1.1)
Category A: Group A: Class 3/b Container-based Computer Systems (section 3.2.3.1.2)
Question:
    a.   There is no reference to a requirement for redundant power supplies in these servers, but the container racks are required to have redundant PDUs (3.2.3.1.g). Are servers with only one power supply acceptable or should there be a requirement for redundant power supplies?

    b.   There are no requirements for network infrastructure switches, etc. (Ethernet or Infiniband). Section 3.2.3.1.p lists Converged networks as desirable. Are there any network infrastructure requirements for Class 3 servers, either Class 3/a or Class 3/b?

Answer: If no requirements are listed, then there are no stated requirements.

557. RFP Reference: 3.2.1.1.i Midrange Cluster and 3.2.2.1.o High-End Cluster

Question: Please clarify that there is a typographical error, and that paragraphs 3.2.2.1.o-p-q were intended to be indented as subparagraphs 4-5-6 under subparagraph 3.2.2.1.n.

Specifically, please clarify that the cluster management software, shared file system, scheduler software, for the high-end cluster is to be "supported and the names of a sample software package provided" (as worded in the mid-range cluster 3.2.1.1.i).

As worded currently in 3.2.2.1.o, it appears that the cluster management software, shared file system, scheduler software, for the high-end cluster should be "proposed", yet there is no place in the pricing file to price this software.

If the answer is to keep the 3.2.2.1.o wording as is, where in the price file should this cost be included?

Answer: Yes this was a typo that is corrected in Amendment 6.

558. RFP Reference: 3.2.3.1.1 a
Question: RFP specifies "Capacity for 20 42U racks (double density). " What does "double density" mean for class 3a Container-based systems? Please clarify and/or provide an illustration of the rack configuration desired.

Answer: The words "double density" has been removed. It referred to the requirement that the 3a capacity was double that of the 3b capacity. See Amendment 6.

559. RFP Reference: 3.1.4.2.a and 3.1.4.2.b
Question: RFP requires C++ and Fortran compiler software. Is the GNU software compiler (providing both C++ and Fortran compilers) acceptable as a solution for the proposal?

Answer: Yes, if it meets the requirements in that section.

560. Document NMMB, Section 4.1.a.6. (Blu-ray: 40 GB Storage) File MMB, item 4.1.a.6 references 40GB storage, whereas page 72 of Attachment "A" Technical Specifications 4.1.a.6 states "External hard disk drive 40GB storage.
Our assumption would be the MMB file is correct? Please confirm

Answer: This requirement was previously removed.

561. RFP page 72, Section 4, and RFP page 77 state that mandatory products must be TAA compliant where applicable. Under FAR Subpart 25.4, Trade Agreements, 25.401 states: Exceptions. (a) This subpart does not apply to— (1) Acquisitions set aside for small businesses;

In light of this clause, can the Government confirm that for small businesses competing for Category B, Group B, and/or Category B, Group C, All proposed mandatory products do not have to be Trade Act (TAA) compliant?

Answer: See answer to question 259.

562. On page 73 of Attachment A, Technical Specs Section 4.2.2 , b, 1, e. Aggregate data transfer rate 4.0 TB/hr (native) with 8 Ultrium 5 drives – says 4.0 TB/hr.
Attachment MMB.xls has 4.2.2.b.1.e. LTO Ent. Library: 4 TB/s transfer rate.
Is the requirement for 4TB per second or 4TB per hour?

Answer: The requirement is for 4 TB/hr.

563. In MMB.xlsx, MMC.xlsx, and MMD.xlsx, rows 5, 6, 7, and 8 state "All mandatory products are [EPEAT, Energy Star, 508, TAA] certified/compliant". In MMA.xlsx, however the rows state "All applicable mandatory products are [EPEAT, Energy Star, 508, TAA] certified/compliant". Since EPEAT, Energy Star, 508, and TAA are not applicable to items such as specialists, data destruction services, software and staples, would the Government please change the requirements in MMB.xlsx, MMC.xlsx, and MMD.xlsx, rows 5, 6, 7, and 8 to read "All applicable mandatory products are [EPEAT, Energy Star, 508, TAA] certified/compliant"?

Answer: See answer to question 120.

564. The flags referenced in A.1.19 are not in the <Classification> tabs. Please confirm the only GWAC proposal response regarding TAA compliance is the Y/N indication in Cell C8 of the Minimum Mandatory spreadsheets.

Answer: These flags will be required after award as part of the upload of data into the SEWP database of record.

565. The RFP provides conflicting instructions regarding Column H in the <Classification> Worksheets. The ReadMe file states, "The proposed discount must be equal to the proposed discount for the corresponding Product Classification and the Classification Description Subgroup proposed in the Product Classification Tab." A.3.15.4.1 agrees stating, "The values in Column H – Classification Subgroup Discount – must match the proposed discounts for the associated Classification Description Subgroup (Column F) from the Product Classifications Worksheet." However, the last sentences of A.3.15.4 paragraphs 3), 4), and 5) use the term "at or above". "For example, if the offeror adds a row to the Product Classification of "Input/Output" with the Classification Description Subgroup of "All Printers" and a discount of 10 (10%), then all printers added to the contract through a technology refreshment request during the life of the contract must have a Product Classification of "Input/Output" a Product Category Description of "All Printers" and discount at or above 10%." Which instructions are incorrect?

Answer: Both are correct. For the initial proposal, the discount must exactly match what is proposed in the corresponding row of the product classification Tab. In the given example, all printers would need to have a 10% discount. As stated in the last paragraph, when products are added to the SEWP database of record through a technology refreshment request, the discount can be at or above the initially proposed discount.

566. There is currently only one tablet device listed on the EPEAT registry. This tablet does not meet the minimum mandatory requirements listed in MMC.xls. This tablet was registered in December of 2012, and the XploreTech corporation only produces 10" ruggedized tablets, not 7 inches in size or under.

The EPEAT organization's Communications Representative, Sarah O'Brien, stated in InfoWorld Magazine (February 28, 21013), "There is one barrier to registering 'slates' in EPEAT -- the fact that there is currently no Energy Star specification that covers these products."

Confusingly, Energy Star 5.0 covered tablets, but with Version 5.2, Energy Star reclassified tablets as handhelds. Here's the exact text: "Slate computing devices, defined here as a type of computer lacking a physical keyboard, relying solely on touchscreen input, having solely a wireless network connection (e.g., Wi-Fi, 3G), and primarily powered from an internal battery (with connection to the mains for charging, not primary powering of the device) are considered handhelds and are not considered

notebook computers. Consequently, slates are not eligible for this version of the Energy Star computer program."

The problem, therefore, is that Energy Star is a required criterion for a machine to garner an EPEAT rating, "so this explicit exclusion of slates means they can't currently be registered," O'Brien said. "Notebook-type slates (the ones that have a slate type surface but are primarily conventional notebooks) can be registered as what we rather clumsily call 'Tablet Notebooks,' but this has not been a popular category." There is no 7" tablet notebook listed as well.

Here is the link to this article: http://www.infoworld.com/t/tablets/why-good-green-tablet-hard-find-213707

There is no proper way to provide a tablet in the minimum mandatory spreadsheet that meets the EPEAT requirement.

Will NASA please change the minimum mandatory EPEAT applicability for the Tablet device?

Answer: See answer to question 366.

567. Page 138 RFP Section III.A.3.12.2 requires "The offeror shall address Statement of Work, Section C.1.3.7. SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT."
Page 116 RFP Section C.1.3.7 states, "To assist the Government in assessing the security and risks associated with supply chain management, the contractor must supply the following information: 1) Prior to requesting the addition of an item, the contractor must indicate the relationship between the contractor and manufacturer as one of the following:..."
Is this information required for each vendor/product with the proposal submission or only with technology refreshment proposals?

Answer: Only with technology refreshment requests.

568. RFP Page 97, 6.3.1.a.2—Requirement states "34-bit digital signal processing resolution." Is this correct, or should it read 14-bit?

Answer: It originally read 34-bit. For clarity this has been updated to read 34 or 38.

569. Reference: 4.1.a.6. Blu-ray Disk Player, 40GB Storage
Question: 4.1.a.6. Blu-ray Disk Player Storage (RFP page 72) requests, "External hard disk drive – 40GB storage." Please clarify possible compliance of the following.
(a) Would internal 40 GB storage be compliant?
(b) Would removable 40 GB storage be compliant?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 4, this requirement was changed to desirable and could be met via internal or external storage.

570. Reference: FAR clauses incorporated by reference
Please confirm that FAR 25.401 applies to Category B, Group B and Group C, acquisition groups set aside for various small businesses.

Answer: See answer to question 259.

571. Reference: 6.2.8. Biometric Scanning Devices

6.2.8.a. Biometric Scanning Devices (RFP page 96) requests technology, "Compliant with SP 800-73 (data APIs) and SP 800-76 (biometric data specification) (desirable)." Please clarify that the desirable feature is for compatibility with SP-800-76 (biometric data specification) since this specification refers to the actual card and not the base card reader.

Answer: That is correct.

572. Reference: 6.2.9. Smart Card Readers

6.2.9.a. Smart Card Reader (RFP page 96) requests technology, "Compliant with SP 800-73 (data APIs) and SP 800-78 (card specification) (desirable)." Please clarify that the desirable feature is for compatibility with SP-800-78 (card specification) since this specification refers to the actual card and not the base card reader.

Answer: That is correct.

573. Reference: 6.2.9. Smart Card Readers

Question: 6.2.9.h. (RFP Page 96) requests, "Readers for access to facilities, computer rooms, etc. (desirable)." Access control readers are a separate form factor from the Smart Card Reader specified in 6.2.9.a through 6.2.9.g. and are not compliant with the base Smart Card Reader specifications. Please clarify the specifications for this desirable feature.

Answer: As a desirable feature, there is no requirement that is match the base Smart Card Reader specifications.

574. Reference: Proposal Due Date

Question: We are experiencing an overall slow response to requests for SEWP V support from market OEMs and Distributors, reportedly due to September being an otherwise very busy month at the end of the Government's fiscal year. Considering this situation beyond our control, would the Government please consider a significant extension in the proposal due date of at least three weeks?

Answer: Please see answer to question 261.

575. Reference RFP Page 135, Section A.3.11, Compliance with minimum mandatory specifications

The solicitation states "Proposals will not be evaluated further and/or considered for award if they do not meet the minimum mandatory specifications. Proposals will not be evaluated if they do not meet the minimum mandatory specifications".

After extensive research with a wide range of the principal manufacturers, distributors and other sources there appear to be a number of products in Groups B, C and D were individual products do not possess all the required features and/or meet required compliance. Has NASA validated that for Groups B, C & D individual COTS products are currently available that fully meets all mandatory requirements and compliance requirements, for each of the listed products in Attachment A?

Answer: The purpose of the lengthy Draft RFP process was in part to provide industry an opportunity to note where a requirement might not be currently achievable. With close to 2000

responses during the draft RFP and RFP phase, the Government believes it has received feedback necessary to ensure all mandatory requirements can be met.

576. As first time SEWP respondents, could we request an on-line demo or a sample model of the price sheet PED-1 with sample data filled in? The narrative on how to fill out the model lacks the clarity needed to assure we're filling it out properly.

Answer: See response to question 284.

577. The Summary tab of the PED-1 workbook has a Proposal total of 35,000,000.00. Is this number in here as a not to exceed threshold amount? As I populate the other tabs, I notice this number increases. Is this your allotted budget for the mandatory items? Should we weigh this total in any way?

Answer: This is the plug number that should decrease or remain constant based on the discounts in the various Classification Tabs. If, for example, in the Computer System Tab, you put $100 in Column G for the List Price and 10 (10%) in Column H for the Classification Subgroup Discount; then in the Available Components Tab, row 6, Column B will have 0.1; and the total will be decreased from $35,000,000 to $34,950,000. It appears that copying and pasting into the Classification Tabs can change the format of Column H from Percentage to General. It is recommended that if cutting and pasting, the spreadsheet you copy from has that corresponding row formatted as percentage to make sure the paste does not change the format.

578. Are we supposed to create our own Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) for all products that are being offered in the catalogue? For Example, item 6.3.2 "Audio Video Monitor and Display Devices"(pg. 98 RFP) is the parent name and is expanded out to items a) stereo speakers, b) wall mountable 46", c) Digital signage monitor, and d) document kiosk. In the PED-1, video conferencing tools tab column B asks for a CLIN number. I don't see one associated in the RFP, unless the CLIN number is 6.3.2.a. Is that sufficient for a CLIN or would you rather standard CLIN number of 001, 002, etc. for each item?

Answer: See <u>A.3.15.1. Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) Structure.</u>

579. On the Installation Tab of PED-1, are we required to give pricing for Labor to install every minimum mandatory item that could have an installer (for example a network device), or every item in minimum and exceeds, or both, or none? Should this price be submitted in terms of dollars/hour?

Answer: This is a <Classification> Tab – i.e. used to provide the proposed available components in this tab related to Installation. See A.3.12.1 Excellence of Proposed Systems (Subfactor A)/ Available Components / Instructions and section 1.4.3. Minimums / Desirables / Advanced Technology / Additional Technology. Labor rates related to installation and similar services can be proposed here in the appropriate manner; e.g. hourly rates.

580. On the Documentation tab of PED-1, should we include documentation pricing for technical documentation for the 2 Labor positions (Information Assurance Network Specialist, Network Engineer(RFP pg. 100)) in the event you need documentation of the services provided (ex: designs, analyses, requirements, configurations). Or is this section reserved for just OEM manuals?

Answer: This is a <Classification> Tab – i.e. used to provide the proposed available components in this tab related to Documentation. You can propose as many types of products and services that fit under the broad term of documentation.

581. Requesting Clarification: Group Database tab is where all the MANDATORY item descriptions and pricing will be populated, then that populates the Mandatory items tab. Product Classification tab is where we need to populate the exceeds for each category? and then include the product details in the "Available components" tabs? If so, should we input formulas to feed from the Product classification tab into the Available components tabs?

Answer: Only enter the information as described in the RFP and README files. Formulas are in place to take the dollars and discounts you provide and feed them into the Available Component Tab.

582. Requesting Clarification: Can we assign different discount levels to specific items within a category? This is what I am reading in A.3.15.4. (pg. 144 RFP). Rather than assigning a generic discount, we would like to offer deep discounting for specific items within a category, therefore, in the classification subgroup, can we include those items that we can give special pricing on?

Answer: You can define as many subgroups and discounts as you wish to propose.

583. Where do we include pricing for the Exceeds? EMDFD-1 does not have a column for pricing.

Answer: If a mandatory item exceeds the minimum then the price for that mandatory item is put in the Group Database tab of the pricing exhibit. For example, if the requirement is for a 1 TB disk and you propose a 2 TB disk, you would put a Y in the corresponding row of the MM worksheet; you would place "2 TB" in the corresponding row of the EMDF worksheet; and you would put the price of the 2 TBdisk in the appropriate row of the Group Database in the PE worksheet.

584. When the Classification Worksheet tabs are populated in the price list column, it results in a #DIV/0! Error in the Available Components tab and Summary tab. However, I am unclear of the relevance these tabs pose on the candidate Primes.

Answer: Formula errors have been fixed in Price Exhibit PED Software tab and Power Related Technology tab. All other formulas are working correctly. Be sure your list prices are greater than or equal to 0 in column G and values between 0 and 100 in Column H. Once filled in your pricing exhibit should not have any #DIV/0! Errors as this would indicate a problem with your pricing submission.

585. Section 6.1.1.1.3 - Wireless interfaces have multiple client-related requirements for encryption and authentication. Section 6.1.2.3 for Wireless Bridges has no such requirement listed. Do the requirements in 6.1.1.1.3 apply to Wireless Bridges wireless interfaces?

Answer: Yes.

586. Based upon our extensive research, the product requested in Section 6.3.2.c has been discontinued and replaced by product CD4235 with the following specs: 42" 1080p Screen, with 8ms panel, 16.3 mm slim bezel, 7 day on/off scheduling, built in speakers, remote and panel control lock out, rs-232 daisy chain capable, with vga/dvi input/outputs. Will the government accept CD4235 as a replacement product?

Answer: See response to Question 286.

587. Studio lighting including 750 watts of high impact strobe output"

We have asked several photographers what "high impact strobe output" means and have received various and inconsistent answers. To date, our product researchers have only found one product using this phrase and it is discontinued. (The following link appears to be the item the government is seeking: http://www.chauvetlighting.com/dmx-mega-strobe-3.html). We found an alternative product which exceeds the minimum by producing up to a 1000 watts of strobe output. Will the government provide additional product specifications to facilitate identification of the desired product or will the government allow bidders to propose alternative products.

Answer: See Response to Question 225. Note that providing a higher wattage lamp would meet and exceed the minimum requirements.

588. Under Section 3.2. Group A: For requirement "3.2.2.1.f.3 All Compute nodes shall have sufficient cooling for full utilization of the entire cluster at maximum sustained processor performance" can the government provide additional information about the data center environmental components to allow for properly designing a solution?

Answer: The environment should be considered ideal. Cooling capacity should be based solely on the systems being proposed.

589. Under Section 3.2. Group A: For requirement 3.2.1.1.d.3 and 3.2.2.1.d.6 Local Area Network requirements for 10Gbe and/or 40GbE, are we required to provide the network switches or are these provided in the government data center since it a network switch does not appear to be listed as a requirement in and of itself? If required to propose a network switch for the Local Area Network, what are the uplink and cabling requirements to connect to the data center infrastructure?

Answer: Network switches are not part of the minimum mandatory requirements.

590. Under Section 3.2. Group A: Requirements 3.2.2.1.f.5 and 3.2.2.1.f.10 seem to contradict one another. For the GPU nodes, do we need to quote both MIC (Xeon Phi) and Tesla K10 GPUs in the same system?

Answer: The Many Integrated Core (MIC) is not a requirement for the GPU nodes.

591. Under Section 3.2. Group A: For requirements 3.2.1.1.d.5, 3.2.2.1.e.4, 3.2.2.1.d.7, 3.2.2.1.e.7, and 3.2.2.1.f.8, does it require hardware or software RAID?

Answer: Either hardware or software RAID may be proposed.

592. Q6 - Under Section 3.2. Group A: For all of the nodes in 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.2.1, is it permissible for the BMC to be a shared port with the network port (i.e., eth0 physical port supporting both data as well as management (BMC) functionality)?

Answer: Yes that is permissible.

593. Under Section 3.2. Group A: Do items b. 10Gbps Ethernet; c. 40Gbps Ethernet (desirable); and d. 100Gbps Ethernet (advanced technology); of requirement 3.2.3.1.1. Class 3/a Container-based Computer Systems items relate to per port speed requirements or for uplink capabilities of the switch

that we must propose for inclusion with the compute and storage requirements of the proposed container solution?

Answer: The requirement refers to "per port speed".

594. Pursuant to Q&A Set 9 dated 5/28/13 in the Draft RFP, is the response to Question 31 still valid for the Final RFP? Here is a copy of that Q&A:
Question 31: Will the government provide the Agency Administrative handling fee or will it be included in pricing evaluation model with the final RFP?
Answer: The initial proposal can be done without the fee. The fee will be incorporated when the products are added to the SEWP Database of Record.

Answer: See answer to question 159.

595. Regarding the "Energy Star compliant" requirement in all groups as shown in Attachment A: Energy Star uses the term "qualified" to refer to products that meet their standards for a particular product family. Please confirm that a product that is Energy Star "qualified" is considered compliant by the Government.

Answer: Yes.

596. Regarding the "EPEAT certified" requirement in all groups as shown in Attachment A: if there are no EPEAT certified products that meet the exact specifications for a minimum mandatory item, but there are EPEAT certified products available that exceed the specifications (such as monitor size for a display or duty cycle for a printer), is the offeror required to provide the EPEAT certified product that exceeds the specification in order to be compliant?

Answer: See response to Question 366.

597. Regarding the "508 compliant" requirement in all groups as shown in Attachment A: when manufacturers complete a VPAT, they indicate if their product supports a specific 508 standard, or if it partially supports the standard with some exception, or if it doesn't support the requirement at all. If the Government intends for all minimum mandatory products to fully support all applicable 508 standards without any exceptions whatsoever, we wish to indicate that, based on our market research and our knowledge of the technology industry, the Government has requested a wide range of mass-marketed and multi-faceted technology in the minimum mandatories that cut across several 508 standards. Many of the minimum mandatory products can only be filled with products that take some exception to one or more of the 508 standards. Given the pass/fail nature of this highly complex requirement, and the fact that 508 compliance is determined at the individual acquisition level, we request the Government maintain the requirement for offerors to submit VPATs for all minimum mandatory products offered, but remove Section 508 compliance as a pass/fail evaluation factor for the minimum mandatory products. This will allow SEWP V customers to determine if a product meets their accessibility needs by viewing the information contained in the VPAT, while removing an ambiguous and unmeetable requirement when applied to such a wide range of technology as an all-or-none pass/fail factor.

Answer: See response to Question 366.

598. Regarding Group B Minimum mandatory product Blu-ray Disc Player (Attachment A, 4.1.a): would the Government also accept a thumb drive for the "External hard disk drive - 40GB storage" so long as it provides the same storage capacity and functionality?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 4, this requirement was revised.

599. Regarding Group B Minimum mandatory product STK T9840D external drive (Attachment A, 4.1.c.2): this product group is a name brand requirement for StorageTek and the manufacturer has announced that this product has reached end of life with no replacement product announced (see https://blogs.oracle.com/eSTEP/entry/end_of_life_for_storagetek). This creates a contradiction with the "New Equipment" requirement for all of Group B that an offeror cannot remedy. With that in mind, please consider removing this minimum mandatory item so Offerors can provide a fully compliant minimum mandatory offering with all new equipment.

Answer: See response to Question 112.

600. Regarding Group B Minimum mandatory product Small Server Room UPS (Attachment A, 4.5.2): the frequency and recharge time requirements appear to be pointing to a product that the manufacturer has confirmed is not TAA compliant. In order to provide several TAA compliant options, we recommend the Government alter the frequency specification from 50/60 hz to just 60hz and change the recharge rate from 3 hours to 4 hours.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this requirement has been updated.

601. Regarding Group C Minimum mandatory product Color Large-Format Plotter (Attachment A, 5.3.1.e): the imaging memory requirement appears tied to a specification that was advertised for discontinued products. New products in the Large-Format Plotter class do not differentiate imaging memory, and instead provide a virtual memory specification. With this in mind, please consider removing the imaging memory requirement.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this requirement has been updated.

602. Regarding Group D Minimum mandatory product Wireless LAN Manager (Attachment A, 6.1.2.2): Does the Wireless LAN Manager need to be capable of providing MPLS functionality as dictated by 6.1.1.1.4. Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS), or does it not apply to this product?

Answer: MPLS functionality does not apply to this product.

603. Reference: 3.1.4.2. Programming Environment
Section 3.1 of the RFP states that offeror must be an Authorized Reseller for the Mid-range cluster, High-end cluster, and Container based systems.
Question: Is the offeror also required to be an Authorized Reseller of the items listed at 3.1.4.2 and 3.2.1.1 in the RFP?

Answer: The requirement is that the offeror be an authorized reseller for the main components; i.e. the computer systems.

604. Reference: C.1.3.4. ELECTRONIC PROCESSES
There are two items in the list following the text "For technology refreshment and contract modifications, at a minimum, the Contractor shall be able to process the following electronic documents." However, item two is blank.
Question: Is there more than one required electronic document? If so, will the Government provide a list of the additional documents to be required?

Answer: See answer to question 349.

605. Reference: Cover letter.
The cover letter states, "The SEWP V business case had been submitted to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and posted on OMB's MAX system. At this time, NASA is working with OMB to finalize any questions and paperwork related to GWAC designation."

Will the Government provide updates to potential offerors concerning progress toward a GWAC designation?

Answer: If GWAC designation is given during the proposal process, there will be an announcement.

606. Reference: A.3.9. SUMMARY OF EXCEPTIONS
This paragraph calls for the offeror to submit "all specific exceptions to the terms, conditions, and requirements of Addenda I and II of this solicitation."

The RFP does not appear to contain an Addendum I (roman numeral one) or an Addendum II. The RFP does contain an Addendum 1 (arabic numeral one).

Please describe the location of Addenda I and II.

Answer: Addendum I and Addendum II –refer to sections I and II or the RFP, Addendum I begins on page 7 of the RFP and Addendum II begins on page 43.

607. Reference: A.3.9. SUMMARY OF EXCEPTIONS
This paragraph calls for "all specific exceptions ... "to the Representations and Certifications (Addendum V)."

The RFP does not appear to contain an Addendum V. Please describe the location of Addendum V.

Answer: Addendum V begins on page 155, as noted in the RFP table of contents.

608. Reference: A.3.9. SUMMARY OF EXCEPTIONS
This paragraph calls for "all specific exceptions ... to the information requested in Addendum III." The RFP does not appear to contain an Addendum III.
Question: Please describe the location of Addendum III.

Answer: Addendum III begins on Page 127, as noted in the RFP table of contents.

609. Reference: Reference: A.3.9. SUMMARY OF EXCEPTIONS
This paragraph makes reference to addenda with roman numerals, I, II, III, and V.
Does this solicitation include an Addendum IV? If so, please describe the location of the addendum.

Answer: Addendum IV begins on page 148, as noted in the RFP table of contents.

610. Reference: A.3.6(b)(1), page limitations for Past Performance Volume
The table indicates that "Customer Evaluations" and "Termination/Descope information" are excluded from the Volume IV page limitations. The table is reproduced below.

However, the answer to Question 6 in SEWP_V_RFP_Questions_and_Answers_1 states, "... customer evaluations and list of terminated contracts are not excluded from the 10- page limit in Past Performance."

Answer: See Revised Answer to Question 6 on Q and A Set #2.

611. Reference: 3.1.4.3. System Software License
This paragraph requires unlimited user licensing for the operating system in class 1 and class 2 systems. It does not explicitly address class 3, Container-based Servers.
Question: Is unlimited user licensing required for class 3 servers?

Answer: No.

612. Regarding: High speed monochrome laser printer (5.2.1.2.)

One of the requirements states "print speed shall be at least 45 pages per minute". Will NASA consider a printer that satisfies this speed requirement with *any* of the supported paper sizes (instead of requiring it for *all* paper sizes)?

Answer: The speed requirement should be met with standard 8.5x11 paper.

613. 6.1.2.1. High End LAN Switches-The description states "High End LAN switch chassis", but the specification listed can easily be met in a stand-alone type switch as many models contain expansion modules.

a. Is a switch with expansion module capable of meeting all the minimum specifications acceptable, or is the government requiring an actual chassis based solution?
b. If an actual chassis based solution is required, what is the minimum number of slots required?

Answer: A chassis based solution is not required. If one is proposed, the number of slots must be the minimal to meet the stated requirements.

614. 5.8. Point of Sale All in One System-Based on our research the specification "a. Splashproof All-in-one" is not a feature claimed by any of the major POS manufacturers (despite some reseller claims). That said, these types of commercial POS systems are normally water resistant and some are industry rated.

Can the government change the term "Splashproof" to "water resistant" or clarify that a "water resistant" POS All-in-one would meet the "Splashproof" description?

Answer: Yes – water resistant would meet the splashproof requirement.

615. Attachment A Technical Specification-In multiple products the government has specified a minimum memory configuration and in addition has specified an additional requirement for an option to upgrade the memory to a specified higher level or simply for the capability to upgrade memory. As memory prices per MB/GB have decreased significantly the actual provided memory for many products now exceeds the required specifications for both base and upgraded memory requirements.

a. For instances where an option for upgraded/expandable memory to a specific value (such as from 256MB to at least 512MB) is required, can the government verify that if a solution which exceeds this optional memory requirement in its base configuration (such as 512MB base memory) will be considered to meet both the base memory and optional upgraded/expanded memory requirements?

b. Where the government has specified a requirement for an option for upgraded or expanded memory where no specific value is stated, can the government verify that if the base memory of the proposed product exceeds the base memory requirement by some value, say by 50% or 100%, the product can be considered compliant with both the base and upgraded/expanded memory requirement.

c. If not, can the government specify the specific amount of total memory required for each product which would satisfy both the based and optional upgrade/expansion memory requirements?

Answer: If the proposed hardware meets or exceeds the minimum mandatory requirement, then that hardware meets the minimum. If it exceeds the minimum (i.e. provides more memory capacity than the minimum requirement), then that can be noted in the EMDF exhibit.
If in Group A the proposed system meets or exceeds the upgrade value, then since the price is included in the base system, the price for the upgrade would be $0 in the pricing exhibit. For example, if the Class 3b storage was priced with 1.8 (or more) Pb in the 3b cluster (instead of just the minimum of .9PB), then the price for the upgrade to 1.8PB would be $0.

616.5.8.3. MFD Consumables-In the DRFP Q&A the following questions and response where provided, but the specification remained the same in the final RFP.

DRFP Question 180: 5.8.3. MFD Consumables: Items a. and b. specify supplies for a ""medium volume monochrome printer"", but no such printer exists in Section 5. Please indicate the correct printer for the Staples and Toner.
Answer: The reference will be changed to high volume.

Can the government please updated 5.8.3. to specify the correct "high volume monochrome" MFD?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment #6, this update has been made at Section 5.9.3.

617.Reference: 6.1.1.1.3.c. Wireless
Question: 6.1.1.1.3.c. Wireless (EDP page 87) requests, "Authentication: 802.1x support, including Protected EAP-Generic Token Card (PEAP-GTC), PEAP-Microsoft Challenge Authentication Protocol Version 2 (PEAP-MSCHAPv2), EAP-Transport Layer Security (EAP-TLS), EAP-Tunneled TLS (EAP-TTLS) and EAP-Subscriber Identity Module (EAP-SIM) to yield mutual authentication and dynamic, per-user, per-session encryption keys (WPA and WPA2), MAC address and standard IEEE 802.11 authentication mechanisms."

We believe PEAP-GTC to be an outdated specification. PEAPv1/PEAP-GTC was created by Cisco as an alternative to PEAPv0/PEAP-MSCHAPv2. It allows the use of an inner authentication protocol other than Microsoft's MSCHAPv2. Even though Microsoft co-invented the PEAP standard, Microsoft never added OS support for PEAPv1, which means PEAPv1/PEAP-GTC has no native Windows OS support. The protocol specifies chaining of multiple EAP mechanisms, but not by any specific method. Use of the EAP-MSCHAPv2 is the most commonly supported method.

Would NASA please remove the PEAP-GTC requirement in favor of PEAP-MSCHAPv2?

Answer: The PEAP-GTC requirement has been removed, upon release of Amendment #6.

618. Exhibit #154863-OTHER-018-008.xls - EMDFD-Group D Exceeding the Minimum Mandatories /Desirable Feature (RFP 6.1.3.1.e and 6.1.3.1.g) is missing item "f".
Is "g" considered item "f"?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 4, this was updated.

619. RFP page 87, Category B: Group D: Network Devices, Computer Security Tools and Advance Video and Conference, Section 6.1.3.1. High End LAN Switches list configurations a – e. Items f – g are missing from Exhibit form 154863-OTHER-018-008.xls as stated listed above.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 4, this was updated.

620. Regarding RFP Attachment G – IT Security Management Plan. Please provide a copy of the IT security management Plan.

Answer: As stated in A.1.1 the IT Security Management Plan applies only to NASA delivery orders, and when applicable, is to be submitted upon the request of the issuing NASA Contracting Officer at the delivery order level.

621. For the Exhibit sheets (MMA, MMB, MMC, MMD, EMDFA, EMDFB, EMDFC, EMDFD, will the customer unlock the forms so we can use them to develop our drafts and equipment comparison analysis?

Answer: No

622. Attachment 154863-OTHER-018-002 is titled incorrectly in the sheet as Group B. This Exhibit sheet should be Group A.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this has been fixed.

623. 5.6.3 - Data Input Devices
The requirement states "A complete motion detector solution including sensor and IP communication module must be provided". Please validate that NASA is looking for a complete solution that includes the two detailed components, rather than just the two individual components.

Answer – Yes. The pricing exhibit has a single deliverable that should include the set of requirements in that section.

624. Category B: Group B
4.2.2 (c) Large robotic device   The current technical specifications for this product are met by a product from only one specific manufacturer (Oracle). Bidders are required to be an authorized reseller for this product, which means all bidders under Group B must be authorized resellers of Oracle. This strictly limits competition for bidders in this group. We recommend NASA change the specifications for this product to use an industry standard technology such as LTO to provide for wider competition.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this requirement has been updated.

625.4.5.2. Small Server Room Environment

e. Recharge time of 3 hours (to 90% after full discharge) the only TAA-compliant unit we have found that meets the technical specifications as stated lists a recharge time of "less than 4 hours." We recommend the Government consider rewording this spec as such so bidders may be fully compliant.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this requirement has been amended to read < 6 hours.

643. 5.9.1. High Volume Monochrome MFD Requirements

The combination of 11x17 paper size and print speeds of 55ppm leans toward high-end copier devices, which are typically sold and serviced by specialized copier dealers. Furthermore, only 4% of the world's paper produced is 11x17. The dealers who distribute these types of devices do not typically sell IT products as specified in this RFP. Similarly, IT resellers are not typically copier dealers making the requirement to be an authorized vendor for this class of product very hard to meet. We therefore suggest the Government consider revising the specification to 8.5x14 paper size with a print speed of 35-40ppm, which is in line with the products generally available to IT vendors and represent the majority of MFP purchases.

Answer: The mandatory will remain as stated. Other printers may be offered as Available Components.

644.5.9.2. Medium Volume Color MFD Requirements The combination of 11x17 paper size and print speeds of 55ppm leans toward high-end copier devices, which are typically sold and serviced by specialized copier dealers. Furthermore, only 4% of the world's paper produced is 11x17. The dealers who distribute these types of devices do not typically sell IT products as specified in this RFP. Similarly, IT resellers are not typically copier dealers making the requirement to be an authorized vendor for this class of product very hard to meet. We therefore suggest the Government consider adjusting the specification to 8.5x14 paper size with a print speed of 35-40ppm, which is in line with the products generally available to IT vendors and represent the majority of MFP purchases.

Answer: The mandatory will remain as stated. Other printers may be offered as Available Components.

645.A.1.3 PROCEDURES FOR ORDERS-Price Decrease: "If the Contractor decreases the price of any item ordered, they shall notify the issuing Contracting Officer via email within 2 business days of the price decrease."
Is there a time limit after which an item has been ordered when the contractor would not be required to notify the Contracting Officer of a price decrease?

Answer: This requirement refers to a price decrease that occurred after the quote and prior to receiving the final signed delivery order.

646.A.1.3 PROCEDURES FOR ORDERS
A.1.7 DISCOUNTS FOR TECHNOLOGY EQUIPMENT
Hypothetical/Possible/Likely Situation: Contractor ABC Company is a SEWP V Contractor and has Contractor ABC's Commercial Price List uploaded to SEWP for the applicable products. On a SEWP V RFQ-by-RFQ basis, Contractor ABC provides "additional spot discounting" to its SEWP Customer for SEWP Products it has on its' Commercial Price List for a particular task order.

Please confirm this "spot discount" does not increase Contractor ABC Company's "going forward" SEWP "discount" for Attachment F since it was a spot discount for a particular task order.

Answer: The discount structure is set at the time of contract award based on the initial proposal and does not change. Spot discounts and other cost savings at both the contract and delivery order level are encouraged and do not affect the base discount structure.

647. A.1.3 PROCEDURES FOR ORDERS
A.1.7 DISCOUNTS FOR TECHNOLOGY EQUIPMENT
Hypothetical/Possible/Likely Situation: From time-to-time (approximately once every 18–24 months), OEM's decrease certain product prices—and as such—Contractor ABC Company may from time-to-time, revise its' Commercial Price List to include this price reduction.
    a.   What Contracting Officer would Contractor ABC need to notify?
    b.   Would the SEWP PMO need to be notified?
    c.   Would the Government Contracting Officer who issued the particular Contractor ABC Task Order need to be notified?
    d.   What notification obligations does Contractor ABC owe to SEWP V Customers?
    e.   If a price decrease takes place seven (7) years into the contract for items that were ordered in Year 1 of the contract, what notification obligations does Contractor ABC owe to the Issuing Contracting Officer?

Answer: Decreases in pricing should be provided through the SEWP Technology Refreshment process. Any requirements for notification to an issuing agency would be provided at the delivery order level by the issuing officer for that order.

648. A.1.7 DISCOUNTS FOR TECHNOLOGY EQUIPMENT Non-Mandatory Pricing:
    a.   Are the offerors required to provide pricing for non-mandatories?
    b.   If yes, are the offerors required to keep the same discounts throughout the life of contract?

Answer: Yes – this is the pricing for Available Components in the various <Classification> tabs and the discount as set in the Product Classifications tab.

649. 3.1.4.2 Programming Environment
Linux: Linux compilers are still implementing the full standards—and revisions are expected to the C++ standard in the near future.
Will partial compatibility be accepted?

Answer: ISO compliance has been changed to a desirable feature.

650. 3.1.5 Documentation
 Is documentation in digital form, such as PDF documents stored on a DVD, acceptable?

Answer: In the section noted in the RFP, we clearly state, "The contractor shall provide access to complete sets of commercially available system and user manuals. All provided documentation shall be available on line".

651. 3.2.1.1 Hardware Configuration Mid-Range Cluster Architecture:
    a.   Are server blades permitted in place of rack-mounted servers?

b.   Can individual server requirements, SAS controllers for example, be considered satisfactory within the blade chassis in place of the server?

c.   What operating system will these servers be using?

Answer: The form factor of the servers (blades vs. rack-mounted) the location of any required SAS controllers; and the operating system is up to the offeror to propose within the context of meeting all stated mandatory requirements.

652.3.2.1.1-e.3 Data Storage-What is the required RAID level?

Answer: RAID is not a requirement.

653.3.2.1.1-e.3.i Data Storage
a.   Is this usable or raw storage?
b.   Is this per data node or is this shared storage among all data nodes?

Answer: The storage requirement is based on raw storage and is per data node.

654.3.2.1.1-f Management Network GbE Switch-Layer 2 with VLAN: Is Layer 2 bridging and trunking required for Layer 2 with VLAN capability as well?

Answer: No. layer 2 bridging and trunking is not explicitly required for Layer 2 with VLAN capability.

655.3.2.1.1-h KVM-Several proposed solutions have controller backplanes, as such physical KVM switching adds to cost and footprint without adding value. Will providing a software-based KVM solution satisfy Requirement 3.2.1.1-h?

Answer: No. For the mandatory system, a hardware based KVM switch is required.

656.3.2.1.1-i.1.i-Supported Software-BIOS Updates and Modifications Across All Nodes: Are there specific distributions and versions which can only be considered for use in the proposed solution?

Answer: There are no specific distributions / versions as long as the proposal meets the stated minimum mandatory requirements.

657.3.2.1.2-d.1-Tape Drives-Fifty Tape Drives: Is encryption for data-at-rest required for vaulted volumes (per information from 3.2.1.2-h.4)?

Answer: No - encryption for data-at-rest is not part of the minimum mandatory.

658.3.2.1.2-d.2-Tape SAN Switches and Cabling-Tape SAN Switches and Cabling (Unspecific Requirement):
a.   Please provide a description of SAN Switches; Gen4 or Gen5 Fibre Channel?
b.   Number of Active Ports?
c.   Expandable to what number?
d.   Any Advanced Features, such as Storage VLAN?
e.   Physical Characteristics?

  f. All SPFS or just for the number of Activated Ports?
  g. Power Supplies?

Answer: The offeror may propose whatever meets the stated minimum mandatory and support the proposed technology. If something is not stated, then the offeror may propose against the minimal requirements as stated.

659.3.2.1.2-e.1-Disk SAN Switches and Cabling- (Unspecific Requirement):
  a. Please provide a description of SAN Switches; Gen4 or Gen5 Fibre Channel?
  b. Number of Active Ports?
  c. Expandable to what number?
  d. Any Advanced Features, such as Storage VLAN?
  e. Physical Characteristics?
  f. All SPFS or just for the number of Activated Ports?
  g. Power Supplies?

Answer: The offeror may propose whatever meets the stated minimum mandatory and support the proposed technology. If something is not stated, then the offeror may propose against the minimal requirements as stated.

660.3.2.1.2-e.1-Disk SAN Switches and Cabling- (Unspecific Requirement): No specification for disk SAN, please provide:
  a. Type and Speed of Drives.
  b. RAID Configuration.
  c. Redundant Controllers.
  d. Power Supplies.
  e. Management Interfaces.

Answer: The offeror may propose whatever meets the stated minimum mandatory and support the proposed technology. If something is not stated, then the offeror may propose against the minimal requirements as stated.

661.3.2.1.2–h.3-Hierarchical Mass Storage System Software-Hierarchical Mass Storage System: What speed is referenced in the requirement "support access at hard disk storage speed to the most/recently accessed files"?

Answer: There is no specific value associated with this speed.

662.3.2.1.2.i-Data Archive-Architectural Description-Hierarchical Mass Storage:
  a. Are multiple tiers of storage required to support the Hierarchical Mass Storage?
  b. Please describe the desired performance characteristics of those tiers and the percentage of the overall storage numbers for each tier; for example:
    • Tier 1: 15K RPM FC (20% of Total Storage).
    • Tier 2: 10K SAS (30% of Total Storage).
    • Tier 3: 7.5K Nearline SAS (50% of Total Storage Capacity).

Answer: The offeror should provide a solution based on the minimum mandatory requirements in the RFP.

663. 3.2.1.2.i-Data Archive-Architectural Description- Missing Required Components: There are no specifications for SAN fibre channel adapters for any type of node. Please provide specifications for:

    a.   Type of Adapters.
    b.   Number of Ports per Adapter.
    c.   Port Speed.
    d.   Number of Adapters per Node.
    e.   Which Nodes, Data and/or Management Nodes?
    f.   Will Fibre Channel Adapters be required?
    g.   Are Tape and Disk SAN Switches Separate, or are the SAN Switches Shared Infrastructure?

Answer: The offeror may propose whatever meets the stated minimum mandatory and support the proposed technology. If something is not stated, then the offeror may propose against the minimal requirements as stated.

664. **Instructions to Offerors (A.3.1.2.1) -** The government requests a narrative description of each item that vendors are proposing, including a description, how it is considered state of the art, overall architecture of the item, and interoperability. Can the government please change the RFP to only request this for primary systems? It seems a little overbearing to have to include this information for peripheral items such as mice and keyboards and will make it hard to fit into the page limits.

Answer: The RFP instruction provides a concise description of the proposed technology. There is no requirement to provide full details on every proposed item.

665. **Category A, Group A – 3.1.f** – Does the RFQ define or reference any standard definition for the Mid-Range Cluster, High-End Cluster, or Container based system?

Answer: These are defined within the Technical Specifications for Group A.

666. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.1.1.d.(1).i** – Will Ivy Bridge processors be accepted?

Answer: Yes.

667. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.1.1d.(3)** – Where are the 10GbE NIC's connected to? There is no 10 Gig switch in the RFQ.

Answer: There is no mandatory 10 Gig switch.   The NIC would either be connected to an existing one; or one purchased separately.

668. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.1.1.(4)(b)** – Is RAID support required on DATA drives?

Answer: No

669. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.1.1.e.1.i** – Will Ivy Bridge processors be accepted?

Answer: Yes.

670. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.1.1.g.1** – Is there any maximum for racks allowed?

Answer: No

671. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.1.1.h.1** – Is the KVM Switch required IP over KVM?

Answer: No

672. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.1.2.b** – Is the requirement for scaling up to 50PB Native or uncompressed?

Answer: The requirement is for uncompressed.

673. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.2.1.d.2** – Will Ivy Bridge processors be accepted?

Answer: Yes.

674. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.2.1.e.2** – Will Ivy Bridge processors be accepted?

Answer: Yes.

675. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.2.1.f.4.a** – Will Ivy Bridge processors be accepted?

Answer: Yes.

676. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.2.1.f.7.a** – Is RAID support required on DATA drives?

Answer: No.

677. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.2.1.f.7.a** – Is the node required to support up to 36TB in the same node?

Answer: The minimum mandatory is 14TB per node. To get credit for the desirable a minimum of 36TB must be provided per node.

678. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.2.1.f.10.a** – How many GPUs required? Is the requirement for nodes with GPUs to support 2 Intel MIC?

Answer: At least one GPU is required. There is no requirement for nodes with GPUs to support 2 Intel MIC.

679. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.2.1.f.10.b** – Is Intel MIC Accepted?

Answer: No

680. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.2.1.j** – Is there any requirement for Maximum racks allowed for this cluster?

Answer: No

681. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.3.1.1.a** - Is a lower number of racks accepted as long as we meet the requirement of 32 nodes and storage upgradable up to 3.6PB?

Answer: The implicit required number of racks is one. The 3/a container must be capable of holding up to 20 racks.

682. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.3.1.1.e.3** – Is there a requirement for RAID?

   Answer: No

683. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.3.1.1.e.5** - Are all 32 nodes interconnected, or is it pair of two nodes?

   Answer: There is no minimum mandatory requirement for interconnection. The offeror should provide a solution based on the minimum mandatory requirements in the RFP.

684. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.3.1.1.e.6** – Can nodes be contained within a single chassis or share a planar?

   Answer: The offeror can propose any solution that provides for the 32 nodes and meets all mandatory requirements.

685. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.3.1.1.f.4** – Is having support for FCoE a default requirement? It will require 8 Gb/s FC port default.

   Answer: There is no default FCoE requirement.

686. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.3.1.2.a** - Is a lower number of racks accepted as long as we meet the requirement of 32 nodes and storage upgradable up to 3.6PB?

   Answer: The implicit required number of racks is one. The 3/b container must be capable of holding up to 10 racks.

687. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.3.1.2.c.5** – Are all 16 nodes interconnected, or is it a pair of 2 nodes?

   Answer: There is no minimum mandatory requirement for interconnection. The offeror should provide a solution based on the minimum mandatory requirements in the RFP.

688. **Category A, Group A – 3.2.3.1.2.d.4** - Is having support for FCoE a default requirement? It will require 8 Gb/s FC port default.

   Answer: There is no default FCoE requirement.

689. **Category A, Group A – 3.3.c** – Does this support include the Application Software Support as well?

   Answer: It is unclear what the question is. The requirement is to be able to provide an Applications Systems Analyst/Programmer as defined in that section.

690. **Category B, Group C – 5.5.1.e** - Since all tablets are either using capacitive or resistive touch screen technologies, the panel will all be glass screen. Please help confirm vendors can use an anti-glare screen protector to meet this requirement.

Answer: Yes – an anti-glare screen protector would meet the requirement.

691. **Category B, Group C – 5.6.1** – In our research we found there are no ergonomic mice with built in wrist support available as a single sku. I would request the government relax the specification by removing the "b. Detachable wrist rest" or making it a desired option.

Answer: See answer to Question 241.

692. **Category B, Group C – 5.6.2** - The closest example of a split key ergonomic keyboard with built-in wrist support is Microsoft natural Ergonomic Keyboard 4000. This is not TAA compliant. It also does not have Energy Star/EPEAT category. Goldtouch does offer split key design with TAA compliance. However, it does not meet "c. Built-in wrist support" requirement. Please relax the requirement by removing the wrist support requirement (or make it a desired option).

Answer: See answer to Question 242.

693. Please clarify the title of Tab 2. In section A.3.7.2. Management/Technical Approach Tab Description lists the title as "Excellence of Proposed Systems." However, section A.3.12.1 Excellence of Proposed Systems (Subfactor A) lists a heading of "Proposed Systems" above the description for Tab 2.

Answer: Tab 2 can be titled Proposed Systems.

694. Please clarify the title of Tab 6. In section A.3.7.2. Management/Technical Approach Tab Description lists the title as "Commitment / Support of supply chain management." However, section A.3.12.2 Offeror's Support and Commitment (Subfactor B) lists a heading of "Commitment to Supply Chain Management and Supply Diversity" above the description for Tab 6.

Answer: Tab 6 can be titled Commitment to Supply Chain Management and Supply Diversity.

695. Under Tab 7 in Section A.3.12.3, the Government asks the Offeror to identify how they shall provide Software Support in response to section C.1.3.1. However, the only reference to Software Support in section C.1.3.1 is under the World Wide Web services; which, in the Q&A set 1, the government states that the Offeror shall only talk to the World Wide Web services in Tab 8. In what section of the RFP are the requirements for Software Support that we are to respond to in Tab 7?

Answer: See answer to question 110.

696. In reference to section 6.1.5, what band (RF spectrum) should the 2 way radio use?

Answer: There is no mandatory requirement for the band to be used.

697. In reference to section 6.1.6, does the IP telephony system need to include a network infrastructure to support IP phones and other system components such as the voice gateway? Since the components of this solution cannot function without a transport network, should it be assumed that this IP telephony system will be integrated into an existing IP network? Or should the response include a network infrastructure to support the VOIP application?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this has been changed to a desirable feature. As long as the basic requirements of this section are met and offered in the available components, then the desirable feature will be met.

698. In reference to section 6.1.6, should the solution include IP phones? If so, how many? Are there any features that these phones need to support?

Answer: See Response to 697.

699. In reference to section 6.3.1, the requirements of the HDTV Studio Camera are specific enough to greatly limit competition among camera manufacturers. There are cameras that do not meet the requirements, but provide superior image quality. Would the government be willing to amend their requirements to allow for other technologies to provide the same or similar video quality?

Answer: The requirements for the HDTV Studio Camera have been revised to be more generic in nature.

700. In reference to section 6.3.1.b.16, are there any additional requirements for the lenses (focal length, minimum aperture, features such as image stabilization)? Lenses can vary greatly in price and performance and we want to ensure we are providing the appropriate product.

Answer: There are no further requirements other than as stated in the RFP.

701. Please provide guidance on what information should be included on the cover pages.

Answer: There is no information that is required in the cover page.

702. In reference to section A.3.6 (a) (3), we suggest adding identification of the Category/Group to the external discs label (and cover pages)

Answer: Offeror can provide identification labels as deemed applicable to their proposal submission.

703. PEA.XLS Tab "Mandatory Items" and Attachment A 3.2.1.3 b. specifies that bidders must provide "database libraries including, but not limited to: 1. Oracle Database 11g R2 Standard Edition or equivalent..." We cannot find any definition or description within Attachment A to clarify the specified "but not limited to" wording. Is the only requirement for the database or are their requirements for add-on tools such as Oracle Spatial and Graph, Partitioning, Compression, etc. Can this attachment be revised to explicitly state what products are required to ensure bidders are proposing a consistent baseline?

Answer: The only required mandatory item is a base Oracle license as described in the RFP.

704. PEA.XLS Tab "Mandatory Items" and Attachment A-The items listed in the "Mandatory Items" tab of PEA.xls do not appear to match the requirements specified in Attachment A for the Mid-Range cluster configuration. Lines 8 through 13 list items that are specified in Attachment A as part of each Mid-Range Cluster. Breaking these items out of the configuration as specified in Attachment A would cause bidders to propose systems that would be non-compliant and non- functional unless all items were ordered by a customer.

Answer: It is understood that a functional system would need to be requested and ordered correctly by the end-user.

705. Can the PEA and Attachment A be revised to reflect a direct correlation between the configurations items specified in Attachment A and the Mandatory Pricing Requirements in the PEA.xls? This should ensure a consistent baseline to evaluate vendors.

Answer: See responses to Questions 269, 270, and 271.

706. PEA.XLS Tab "Mandatory Items" and Attachment A-The items listed in the "Mandatory Items" tab of PEA.xls do not appear to match the requirements specified in Attachment A for the High-End cluster configuration. Lines 21 through 28 list items that are specified in Attachment A as part of each High-End Cluster. Breaking these items out of the configuration as specified in Attachment A would cause bidders to propose systems that would be non-compliant and non- functional unless all items were ordered by a customer.

Answer: See response to Question 704.

707. PEA.XLS Tab "Mandatory Items" and Attachment A-details multiple software license requirements. PEA.xls provides rows to account for software purchase pricing but not software maintenance. Please clarify the minimum software maintenance requirements for mandatory items.

Answer: See A.3.14.5. Warranty Pricing for information on how to price maintenance/ warranty.

708. Attachment A 3.2.1.1 d and e. provides the requirements for the data nodes within the mid-range cluster. Section d requires a NIC for the management nodes to connect to the 10GbE Local Area Network. There does not appear to be a similar requirement for the same connectivity within the data nodes specified in Section d. There is also no switch specified for the Local Area Network. Please confirm that the Data Nodes do not require the 10GbE NIC, and that bidders are not required to provide a switch to connect the network.

Answer: See response to Question 667.

709. Attachment A 3.2.1.2 Data Archive h. Provides the requirements for the HSM software. Item 10 specifies scalable up to 50PB. We cannot find a specified minimum mandatory requirement for the software. The size of the HSm complex depends on what storage systems are included within it. Please clarify the minimum capacity required for the software and which of the mid-range items (36TB DataNodes, Disk Cache, Tape System are included). Additionally please clarify if the storage system "archive" includes only tapes that are in the device, or if it includes tapes that have been migrated to shelf.

Answer: The offeror must propose at least a minimal solution that meets the stated requirements. There is no "archive" requirement beyond that stated in 3.2.1.2.h.4 in terms of vaulting.

710. A.1.35-A small business concern submitting an offer in its own name shall furnish, in performing the contract, only end items manufactured or produced by small business concerns in the United States or its outlying areas. Does this clause apply to respondents of Group C, where mandatory products may not have been manufactured or produced by small business concerns?

Answer: Yes.

711. 5.1.1 -RGB video input signal-Does the Government intend that the monitor should have component RGB connectors? Or simply decode a RGB video signal using standard (eg VGA or DVI) connections?

Answer: This has been revised to state VGA.

712. 5.1.1 -Intel PC and Apple Macintosh compatibility -Since different generations of PC and Macintoshes use VGA or DVI connections, can you confirm which is required?

Answer: A connection adaptor would meet this requirement.

713. 5.1.1 -Intel PC and Apple Macintosh compatibility-Is native connector support required, or can a supplied connection adaptor be used?

Answer: A connection adaptor would meet this requirement.

714. 5.1.2 -1600x1200 maximum resolution, Aspect Ratio of 16:10 (WXGA)-Since 1600x1200 resolution has an aspect ratio of 4:3 (UXGA), should the projector support both 16:10 and 4:3 aspect ratios? Or should it scale down to WXGA?

Answer: The projector requirements have been clarified. Only 16:10 is required.

715. 5.6.1 -Elevated hand support for maximum stress reduction,- Detachable wrist rest (desirable) Is it the Government's intention that the mouse be bundled with a mousepad to provide the support and wrist rest? Should the mousepad be offered/priced separately as an optional item?

Answer: See response to Question 241.

716. 5.7 Embedded encryption using Advanced Encryption Standard software
Can you provide additional guidance as to the method and level of encryption required?

Answer: The requirement is to include embedded encryption. The method and level is up to the offeror to propose.

717. SF30 Solicitation response date on SF1449 is extended from October 15, 2013 to October 18,2013. Would the Government consider an extension past October 18 2013 for submission?

Answer: Please see answer to Question 261.

718. A.3.13- Section A- Past Performance Volume-Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for up to five of your most recent similar contracts that are completed or ongoing, within three years of the solicitation due date. Indicate which contracts are most related and how they are related to the proposed effort in content and scope, as well as which contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract.

Would the Government please confirm that Commercial Past Performance is sufficient and will be evaluated in a similar fashion as Government Past Performance?

Answer: The requirement is for any similar contract—Federal, state, local, and commercial included.

719. C.1.3.2-Program Office Support-Can the government please clarify what information it wants provided as the Contractor Program Manager's full contact information?

Answer: Name, address, phone, email, fax number and any other relevant information to assist in communicating with the Program Manager.

720. A.3.81-"Offeror Representations and Certifications – the offeror shall appropriately complete and return.

Offeror Representations and Certifications—Commercial Items (52-212-3).State any deviations/exceptions taken to the required Offeror Representations and Certifications and include the reason for the deviation/exception."

Is a hard copy of completed Reps and Certs still required as part of the Offer Volume in addition to completing electronically as requested on p127 of RFP III. Instructions to Offerors (b) Submission of offers (8) Representations and Certifications?

Answer: No, the requirement is to complete Offeror Representations and Certifications, which begin on Page 155 of the RFP.

721. A.3.6 (b)(1)Text in Diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be no smaller than 10 point. Diagrams, tables, artwork, and photographs shall not be used to circumvent the text size limitations of the proposal.

Is Arial font acceptable for diagrams, schedules, charts, tables or graphics?

Answer: The font in these types of attachments is not specified.

722. A.3.11.1. Instructions for TAB 1-Information contained in TAB 1 will be used solely to determine if the proposed mandatory items meet all mandatory requirements. Information contained in TAB 1 will not be reviewed during the proposal evaluation.

Please clarify the statement that "Information contained in TAB 1 will not be reviewed during the proposal evaluation" as the first section of this section indicates Tab 1 is evaluated as part of the meeting the Minimum Mandatory Specifications. (also referenced as an evaluation specification on page 148)?

Answer: The exhibit is used solely to determine if the minimum mandatories are met and is not evaluated further. Proposal evaluation occurs after a determination is made that a proposal has met the minimum mandatory.

723. A.3.6 (a)(3) Electronic files of Volumes I, II, III, and IV shall be on virus free CD-ROM (CD-R format) discs with an external label indicating:
Given the potential size of the volumes, will the Government accept DVDs in lieu of CD-ROMS?

Answer: See answer to question 520.

724. A.3.13(a) INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR-Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for up to five of your most recent similar contracts that are completed or ongoing, within three years of the solicitation due date.   Indicate which contracts are most related and how they are related to the proposed effort in content and scope, as well as which contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract.
How does the Government wish the offeror to indicate "which contracts are most related"?

Answer: See answer to question 718.

725. 5.1.4. -An Interactive Whiteboard (a dry-erase whiteboard writing surface which can capture writing electronically and allows interaction with a projected computer image) shall be provided with the following minimum requirements.

What are the connectivity requirements, for example WiFi, HDMI Port, DVI Port, VGA Port, Composite, RCA AV, etc?

Answer: The offeror should provide their proposed connectivity. There is no minimum requirement.

726. 5.2.1.2.-High Speed Monochrome Laser Printer-   Any particular distribution of UNIX or LINIX (For example, HPUX, IBM AIX, Oracle Solaris, RED HAT LINUX, SUSE LINUX, Ubuntu LINUX, Centos LINUX?

Answer: No.

727. 5.4.1 -High Speed/High Performance Scanner- Is any WiFi or Ethernet connectivity required?

Answer: No.

728. 5.5.1. Small format Tablet - tablet computer, or simply tablet, is a one-piece mobile computer, primarily operated by touch screen (the user's finger essentially functions as the mouse and cursor, removing the need for the physical (i.e., mouse and keyboard) hardware components necessary for a desktop or laptop computer; and, an onscreen, hideable virtual keyboard is integrated into the display).
Any specific operating system required – Apple, Android or Windows?

Answer: The requirement has been changed to a desirable feature and is an optional physical keyboard. Other forms of a tablet may be offered in the Available Components'. There is no stated minimum for the OS.

729. 5.6.1.g-Ergonomic Mouse-Does this mean wireless?

Answer: See answer to question 241.

730. A.1.3 Past Performance Volume States "This shall be Tab 1 of the Past Performance Volume." What is this referring to? Is there more than one Tab for Volume IV?

Answer: See answer to question 309.

731. **6.3.2.a Stereo Speakers** – "2 speakers including tweeter and woofer" Is the requirement for two speaker enclosures with a woofer and tweeter each, or a single speaker enclosure that has two individual speakers built into the enclosure?

Answer: Either would meet the requirement.

732. *Alternate II (Oct 2001).* As prescribed in 19.708(b)(1)(ii), substitute the following paragraph (c) for paragraph (c) of the basic clause:
(c) Proposals submitted in response to this solicitation shall include a subcontracting plan, that separately addresses subcontracting with small business, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned small business concerns. If the offeror is submitting an individual contract plan, the plan must separately address subcontracting with small business, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned small business concerns with a separate part for the basic contract and separate parts for each option (if any). The plan shall be included in and made a part of the resultant contract. The subcontracting plan shall be negotiated within the time specified by the Contracting Officer. Failure to submit and negotiate a subcontracting plan shall make the offeror ineligible for award of a contract.

Please confirm that an approved corporate Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan fully meets the requirements in A.3.8 and no SEWP V specific Small Business Subcontracting Plan or Small Business Participation Plan is required.

Answer: A Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan is required and fully meets the requirements in A.3.8 of the RFP.

733. C.1.3.2 PROGRAM OFFICE SUPPORT states, "The Contractor Program Manager must be dedicated solely to a single Contractor." Is this a typo? Please clarify what the Government means by "dedicated to a single Contractor".

Answer: This means that a Program Manager cannot hold that position with multiple SEWP Contract Holders.

734. C.1.3.4 ELECTRONIC PROCESSES states, "For technology refreshment and contract modifications, at a minimum, the Contractor shall be able to process the following electronic documents" where item 2) is blank. Please clarify

Answer: See answer to question 349.

735. D.5 Order Status Report states, "The order status report may be provided either via: a. an email with the order status report in textual format. The text must follow a keyword – value format with predefined keywords. The keywords and values must be separated by an agreed upon delimiter;" Is a semicolon (;) the delimiter? Are other delimiters permitted? If so, what are the other approved delimiters? Please clarify.

Answer: The separator will be determined post-contract award.

736. A.3.6.(a).(3) PROPOSAL FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION requires the following: "Electronic files of Volumes I, II, III, and IV shall be on virus free CD-ROM (CD-R format) discs with an external label indicating: (1) the name of the offeror, (2) the RFP number, (3) the format and software versions used,

(4) a list of the files contained on the disk and (5) date of the information. In the event of any inconsistency between data provided on electronic media and hard copies, the hard copy data will be considered to be correct." It may be impossible for offerors to accomplish number (4), provide "a list of the files contained on the disk" on an external label due to the number and length of the many files (especially pricing files) that may be on the CD. Will the Government please relax this requirement?

Answer: If the list of files will not fit on the label, the label may reference a supplemental hard copy document that provides the list of all files for each CD-ROM.

737. A.3.6.(b).(2) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS requires 12 point Times New Roman font. Does this font and size restriction apply to document headers and footers? May offeror use another font and a smaller font in the header and footer?

Answer: There is no font size/type restriction on headers and footers, since this content will not be evaluated. Yes, another font and/or a smaller font may be used for headers and footers. The instructions state the following: "The margins may contain headers and footers, but shall not contain any proposal content to be evaluated."

738. TAB 3 specifies "available hardware and software components beyond the mandatory deliverables including additional technology and product based services that further enhance and broaden the offeror's proposal with respect to the third Acquisition Objectives in Attachment C, Statement of Work". Please explain how this differs from the Exceeding Minimum products requirement in TAB 4.

Answer: Exceeding the minimum refers to an item proposed to meet a minimum mandatory requirement and actually exceeds that requirement; e.g. proposing a 4TB disk to meet a 2 TB minimum mandatory. Available components are items beyond the minimum mandatory items that increase the breadth and depth of product offerings.

739. In regards to TAB 3, Does the Government want to know which other products can be added to increase functionality or how can the requested product be upgraded to increase functionality?

Answer: Tab 3 is the Available components tab. This is the list of items beyond the minimum mandatories that provide depth and breadth to the proposal.

740. This vendor requests that the NASA SEWP V response date be extended until 15 November 2013 as we have inquiries regarding pricing and technology and cannot solidify our response until we receive the answers to our Q & A.

Answer: See answer to question 261.

741. 5.2 – Printers
Core Printer Requirement states, "all MM printers possess Adobe Postscript Level 3.0 formatted print files". Does NASA consider Postscript Level 3 emulation to be acceptable?

Answer: Yes.

742. 5.2 – Printers
A Core Printer Requirement is "Duplex by default". A Monochrome printer requirement is "Automatic duplex printing". Can NASA please clarify the distinction?

Answer: There is no distinction.

743. For Mandatory Item 21 inch LCD Monitor is a 21.5" or 21.5"W monitor acceptable? And would that be considered Minimum exceeded?

Answer: Yes it is acceptable and it would exceed the minimum.

744. For Mandatory Item 21 inch LCD Monitor is VGA port acceptable input for RGB video input requirement?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this has been updated to VGA.

745. For Mandatory Item 21 inch LCD Monitor please elaborate on PC and Mac requirement field. All monitors support Mac computers should an appropriate Mini DisplayPort Adapter be used, but few monitors will plug directly into a Mac. Can we assume user will have the needed Mac adapter?

Answer: Yes.

746. For Mandatory Item Portable LCD Projector please elaborate on PC and Mac requirement field. All monitors support Mac computers should an appropriate Mini DisplayPort Adapter be used, but few monitors will plug directly into a Mac. Can we assume user will have the needed Mac adapter?

Answer: Yes.

747. ON the pricing spreadsheets, PEA, PEB, PEC and PED, could NASA please explain what they are expecting from vendors in the Tabs labeled Documentation, Analysts, Training and Installation?

Answer: Available components that fit within these broad categories and fall within the scope of SEWP.

748. Regarding NASA's guidance in the Procurement Information Circular (PIC 13-04) released on June 6, 2013, which states "Entity owned, directed or subsidized by the People's Republic of China" means any organization incorporated under the laws of the People's Republic of China (PRC) which does not appear in Section 516 included in the Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2013 signed on March 26, 2013. However, assuming the definition above of language in PIC 13-04 applies then if Lenovo is incorporated under the laws of Hong Kong, publicly traded on the Hong Kong Stock Exchange; receives no subsidies from the PRC; has no principal officers or directors who are appointed by the PRC, or any entity controlled by the PRC; and has no shares which are directly owned by the PRC, does this language require that NASA conduct a risk assessment of IT hardware or software manufactured or assembled by Lenovo?

Answer: This clause will be implemented at the delivery order level based on the procedures in place at that time at NASA.

749. Regarding the Procurement Information Circular released by NASA on June 6, 2013, only NASA is restricting the OEM and/or reseller community at this time for the SEWP contract. Is it correct that all OEM's that fit the NASA interpretation of Section 516 must provide the NASA CIO assessment of cyber-espionage risk of any equipment that is produced in China or from Chinese-owned firms prior to bid submission and prior to agency purchase?

Answer: This would be handled post-award at the delivery order level.

750. Regarding the Procurement Information Circular released by NASA on June 6, 2013, if approval cannot be provided by the NASA CIO before October 18, 2013, are resellers and/or OEMs prohibited from including products produced, manufactured or assembled in China in their CLIN/pricing tables in their SEWP V proposal submissions?

Answer: No. The SEWP Proposal is not a purchase. The prohibition is against the purchase of those items.

751. Regarding the Procurement Information Circular released by NASA on June 6, 2013, is it correct that NASA will also restrict IT OEMs that utilize Other Direct Manufacturing (ODM) facilities and facilitators that produce, manufacture or assemble equipment in China such as Foxconn and Wistron?

Answer: Any restrictions will be handled by NASA at the delivery order level.

752. Will NASA require the manufacturers that utilize ODMs to acquire the NASA CIO assessment of cyber-espionage risk of any equipment that is produced, manufactured or assembled in China referenced in their CLIN/pricing tables prior to the October 18, 2013 submission?

Answer: This would be handled post-award at the delivery order level.

753. RFP Reference: 6.4 Racks/Enclosures/Carts: Computer Rack Enclosure
this question is in regards to the Computer Rack Enclosure and requirement d2. The requirement is for solid top panel fans, however, if the top has fans then it will not be solid. Please provide clarification of this requirement.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the word "solid" has been removed from the requirement.

754. RFP Reference: 6.1.4.3.2 General Protocol Requirements, Requirement D. Frame Relay Protocols
Question: Is it possible to make this item a 'Desirable'? Frame relay is an older protocol technology and has been discontinued or replaced by most service providers with Ethernet technology and products.

Answer: This was previously updated to a desirable feature.

755. Reference: 6.1.10 Network Diagnostic Tools, Requirement 4. RMON2 traffic analysis
The requirement in question is dated and no longer valid. The vendor, Fluke Networks, whose product (Optiview Series II Integrated Network Analyzer) was used to write the draft RFP was replaced by the Optiview XG. This unit exceeds the specification requirements but no longer supports RMON2. Based on this knowledge, we recommend the Government remove the RMON2 requirement.

Answer: This requirement has been updated to simply read Traffic Analysis without specifying the type.

756. RFP Reference: 6.1.10 Network Diagnostic Tools, Requirement 3. Circuit Test Equipment
Based on vendor feedback, the requirement is too vague to determine whether or not their product is considered "meeting" the specification. Will the Government confirm that the following explanation is accurate and satisfactory in defining Circuit Test Equipment, "Device will ping from the management interface of the card to a remote end and see if the circuit is connected."

Answer: Circuit test equipment is a desirable item and has been changed to read Layer 1 test equipment (fiber, copper, etc.). If the offeror proposes an item identified as such, the desirable feature will be met.

757. RFP Reference: 6.3.2 42 Inch Digital Signage Monitor Requirement 2. 16.3mm slim bezel

Question: Based on extensive research, we have determined that very few products that meet TAA Compliance are able to meet this requirement. There are more options with 18 and 19mm thick bezels, and as a result we ask the Government to consider changing the bezel requirement to 20mm and under.

Answer: See answer to Question 286.

758. RFP Reference: Radio Equipment
Question: Will the Government provide more context regarding the use of the two-way radio in order to provide the Government with a solution that will fully meet its operational and mission needs?

Answer: There is no specific context – any radio that matches the stated requirements may be offered.

759. 6.1.4.2 Large Network Router-• General Networking Specs
6.1.1.1.2 802.2 Data Link Layer
As written: "Ethernet shall include the Data Link Layer protocol providing Logical Link Control [ISO 8802/2]."
Proposed modification: "Ethernet shall include the Data Link Layer protocol providing Logical Link Control [ISO 8802/2; IEEE 802.2].

Answer: Reference to IEEE 802.2 has been added.

760. RFP Reference: 6.1.10 Network Diagnostic Tools, Requirement 3. Circuit Test Equipment
Question: Based on vendor feedback, the requirement is too vague to determine whether or not their product is considered "meeting" the specification. Will the Government confirm that the following explanation is accurate and satisfactory in defining Circuit Test Equipment, "Device will ping from the management interface of the card to a remote end and see if the circuit is connected."

Answer: Circuit test equipment is a desirable item and has been changed to read Layer 1 test equipment (fiber, copper, etc.). If the offeror proposes an item identified as such, the desirable feature will be met.

761. RFP Reference: Radio Equipment
Question: Will the Government provide more context regarding the use of the two-way radio in order to provide the Government with a solution that will fully meet its operational and mission needs?

Answer: There is no specific context – any radio that matches the stated requirements may be offered.

762. 6.1.4.2 Large Network Router-• General Networking Specs
6.1.1.1.2 802.2 Data Link Layer
As written: "Ethernet shall include the Data Link Layer protocol providing Logical Link Control [ISO 8802/2]."
Proposed modification: "Ethernet shall include the Data Link Layer protocol providing Logical Link Control [ISO 8802/2; IEEE 802.2].

Answer: Reference to IEEE 802.2 has been added.

763. 6.1.1.1.4 Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS)
MPLS Architecture (RFC 3031)
Question: RFC 3031 is a PROPOSED STANDARD updated by RFC 1513. Will the government consider replacing RFC 3031 with RFC 1513?

Answer: RFC 1513 does not deal with MPLS. RFC 3031 is a proposed standard and has been updated by proposed standards RFC 6790 and 6178. Due to the proposed status, RFC 3031 will be replaced by a desirable feature of RFC 6790 and 6178

764. MPLS Signaling: Label Distribution Protocol (RFC 3036) or RSVP
Question: RFC 3036 is a PROPOSED STANDARD obsoleted by RFC 5036. Will the government consider replacing RFC 3031 with RFC 5036?

Answer: The reference has been updated to RFC 5036

765. 6.1.1.2 Network Management
6.1.1.2.1 Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)
Provide an SNMP agent [RFC 1157; RFC 1213] for remote network management and monitoring
Question: RFC 1213 is updated by RFC 2011, RFC 2012, & RFC 2013. Will the government consider replacing RFC 1213 with RFC 2011, RFC 2012, & RFC 2013?

Answer: Reference to RFC 1213 has been removed.

766. Full RMON or RMON II capability (RFC 1271) (desirable)
Question: RFC 1271 has been updated by RFC 1513. Will the government consider replacing RFC 1271 with RFC 1513?

Answer: The reference to RFC 1271 has been updated to RFC 1757, under Amendment #6.

767. 6.1.4.3.2 General Protocol Requirements
Point-to-Point (PPP) Protocol [RFC 1661]
Question: RFC 1661 has been updated by RFC 2153. Will the government consider replacing RFC 1661 with RFC 2153?

Answer: This has been updated to either 1661; 2153; and/or 5342.

768. 6.1.4.3.3 Routing Protocols
TCP/IP Internet Protocol
Routing Information Protocol (RIP) [RFC 1058]
Question: RFC 1058 has been updated by RFC 1388 & RFC 1723. Will the government consider replacing RFC 1661 with RFC 1388 & RFC 1723?

Answer: This has been updated to RFC 1058 or subsequent version.

769. Routing Information Protocol 2 (RIP2) [RFC 1723]
Question: RFC 1723 has been obsoleted by RFC 2453. Will the government consider replacing RFC 1723 with RFC 2453?

Answer: The reference has been updated to RFC 2453

770. Border Gateway Protocol [RFC 1771-1774]
Question: RFC 1771 has been obsoleted by RFC 4271. Will the government consider replacing RFC 1771 with RFC 4271?

Answer: The reference has been updated to RFC 4271

771. IP Multicast
PIM [RFC 2362]
Question: RFC 2362 has been obsoleted by RFC 4601 & RFC 5059. Will the government consider replacing RFC 2362 with RFC 4601 & RFC 5059?

Answer: The reference has been updated to RFC 4601 and 5059.

772. 6.1.5.3.4 Network Management
NTP version 3 or later, at least in client mode [RFC 1305]

Question: RFC 1305 has been obsoleted by RFC 5905. Will the government consider replacing RFC 1305 with RFC 5905?

Answer: The reference has been updated to RFC 5905.

773. Support RADIUS [RFC 2865]
Question: RFC 2865 has been updated by RFC 2868, RFC 3575, RFC 5080, & RFC 6929. Will the government consider replacing RFC 2865 with RFC 2868, RFC 3575, RFC 5080, & RFC 6929?

Answer: RFC 2865 remains the stated base requirement.

774. Support SYSLOG [RFC 3164]
Question: RFC 3164 has been obsoleted by RFC 5424. Will the government consider replacing RFC 3164 with RFC 5424?

Answer: The reference has been updated to RFC 5424.

775. ISIS MIB [RFC 1195]
Question: RFC 1195 has been update by RFC 1349, RFC 5302, & RFC 5304. Will the government consider replacing RFC 1195 with RFC 1349, RFC 5302, & RFC 5304?

Answer: RFC 1195 remains the stated base requirement.

776. ISIS MIB [RFC 1850] (desirable)
Question: RFC 1850 has been obsoleted by RFC 4750. Will the government consider replacing RFC 1195 with RFC 4750?

Answer: The reference has been updated to RFC 4750.

777. l. ISIS MIB extensions for DS1 [RFC 1406; RFC 1239] and DS3 [RFC 2496; RFC 1239](desirable)
Question: RFC 1406 has been obsoleted by RFC 2495. Will the government consider replacing RFC 1195 with RFC 2495?

Answer: The reference has been updated to RFC 2495.

778. Question: RFC 2496 has been obsoleted by RFC 3896. Will the government consider replacing RFC 2496 with RFC 3896?

Answer: The reference has been updated to RFC 3896.

779. RFP Reference: 6.1.6 IP Telephony System: Requirement a2. MGCP
Question: Does the proposed system require MGCP or is a competitive platform's proprietary protocol appropriate as a substitute to Cisco's MGCP?

Answer: See response to Question 697.

780. RFP Reference: 6.1.6 IP Telephony System: Requirement a1. ITU H.323v2 protocol suite and f. H.323 Gateway
Question: The protocols listed are outdated, vendor proprietary communication protocols. They have been surpassed by Session Initiation Protocol (SIP). At this date and time, only Avaya supports H323. Will the Government relax this technical specification in order to allow for a more broad range of products to be bid?

Answer: See response to Question 697.

781. Will the government consider removing the "General Networking" requirements from the IP Telephony section? The General Networking Specs section should not be included in the requirements for IP Telephony Systems as any modern Ethernet network environment can support a modern IP telephony system. The network and telephony equipment and software need not be from a single vendor, and the listing of these two elements in such a fashion makes this look to be a Cisco only contract.

   Answer: See response to Question 697.

782. On Page of 137 of RFP, it states that tab 3 shall not count in the page total; is this correct that tab 3 of the Mgmt/Tech Approach Vol II will not count toward the page count? It isn't listed in the below table from the RFP, page 132, Tech/Management sections only. The only sections excluded from page count is Tab 1 according to the table.

Proposal Component	Volume	Page Limitations
Offer Volume	I	None
Management/Technical Approach Volume	II	90 Pages
(a) Cover Page, Indices,		Excluded
(b) Deviations and Exceptions		Excluded
(c) Tab 1		Excluded

   Answer: See answer to question 40.

783. Also, will the Executive Summary count in the 90 page limitation?

   Answer: Yes, the Executive Summary is included in the Page Limitation.

784. Reference 4.2.1.a, 4.2.2.c,d,e and MMB.xl rows 61-71, 72-79, and 80-87. We do not see a mechanism within the spreadsheet for specifying compliance with the interface requirement in 4.2.1.a for the large robotic device or for the blade array raid. Please clarify if the requirement applies to these devices and if so how to document compliance in MMB.xls Also, request that the Government clarify if this is also the case for the scalable RAID or if the only acceptable interface for the scalable RAID is fibre channel.

   Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the exhibit has been amended. The scalable RAID must be Fibre Channel attachable.

785. Reference 4.2.1.a. Request that the Government add iSCSI to the list of acceptable interfaces to permit this offeror to propose state of the art technology for storage devices in 4.2.2

   Answer: See response to Question 438.

786. Reference A.3.15.4 and RFP Question and Answer #34. Our understanding is that the proposal pricing instructions in A.3.15.4 state that the discount for individual products in a Subgroup must "match or be greater" than the discount proposed for the subgroup in the Product Classification Worksheet. The Question, however, states that the discount "must match (rather than match or exceed)" and the Answer states that for the purposes of proposal only that is correct. Request that the Government review this response and consider allowing the directions in A.3.15.4 to govern the proposal submission (allowing subgroups to define a minimum discount level for all items in that subgroup) as doing otherwise will dictate the creation of a large number of extraneous subgroups to accommodate different discounts for related products (e.g. color laser printers with 10%, 12% and 15% discounts) and, as best we understand the pricing evaluation, will have no impact on the price evaluation model.

Answer: The instructions will remain as stated – the discount must exactly match the subgroup discount proposed in the Product Classification Worksheet.

787. Attachment A - Technical Specifications; Section 6.3.2.c. Audio Video Monitor and Display Devices - 42 inch digital signage monitor Question: We find only one OEM with a product meeting the "16.3mm slim bezel" requirement exactly. To ensure more than one compliant product is available and enhance competition, would the government relax the bezel size to "Less than 20mm slim bezel"?

Answer: See response to Question 286.

788. Attachment A - Technical Specifications; Section 6.3.1.d. Video Acquisition Devices - Studio lighting including 750 watts of high impact strobe output Question: Some 750 watt studio lighting products have been discontinued, and current market trends point to a broader range of products in the 1000-3000 watt range. Would the government consider increasing the wattage requirement to ensure multiple compliant products / competition and to reflect market trends?

Answer See Response to Question 225. Providing a lamp greater than 750 W would meet and exceed the minimum mandatory.

789. Attachment A - Technical Specifications; Section 6.1.6. Internet Protocol (IP) Telephony System Question: The specification does not establish a baseline number of users for the system, but requires "Scalable to support at least 25,000 simultaneous users." This could mean offerors will propose significantly different systems at widely varying price points. Would the government consider requiring a nominal number of users in the specifications to establish a consistent baseline?

Answer: See response to question 697.

790. [3.2.3.1.c] We interpret the requirement such that the minimum requirement is to support 10 seconds of a transient power fluctuations and short-term interruptions without disruptions to the equipment in the container. Is this interpretation correct?

Answer: Yes.

791. [3.2.3.1.c] We interpret the requirement such that providing support for transient power fluctuations and short-term interruptions longer than 10 seconds without disruptions to the equipment in the container exceeds the requirement. Is this interpretation correct?

Answer: Yes.

792. With regard to the minimum mandatory items listed in the class database tab of the pricing exhibit: A number of the minimum mandatory products required are actually not stand alone products, but groups of components that are brought together to meet the minimum mandatory product. For example, the 6.1.4.1. Medium Network Router from Cisco is actually comprised of 6 individual components. Per the instructions contained in the Draft RFP Q&A, the contractor is to list the primary or base component in the Class Database Tab and the bundle should be explained in the proposal. What price is to be included in the Class Database Tab, just the price of the primary component listed or the price of the bundle? If it is the price of the bundle, then that price will not match the price of the primary component as listed in the Available Products Tab. Further, there will be no way to identify what is included in the bundle except to go back to the narrative in the proposal making determining what is in each bundle from each offer very difficult and time consuming. If only the primary or base component price is listed, then NASA will have no way to determine what the actual price is to meet the minimum mandatory requirements. We request that NASA allow a bundled offering to be listed, with the bundle price and a list of the components that comprise the bundle.

Answer: The price in the exhibit should be the total price of all components needed to meet the minimum mandatory requirements for that product. If it is a bundle, the list of items should be listed in the description field in the Group Database Worksheet. Eash item in the bundle should be in the Available Components worksheets.

793. Attachment A - Technical Specifications; Section 6.2.6. Virtual Private Network Appliance Question: Specification "o." requires "Load balancing options." Different vendors have varying interpretations of this requirement. Could the government clarify what specific load balancing options are required?

Answer: See response to Question 290

794. Please confirm the applicability of section 508 to each individual mandatory product so as to identify which mandatory products must meet Section 508 compliance.

Answer: See response to Question 366.

795. Market research indicates that ISS Internet Scanner is an end-of-life product and no longer available. Does the Government have a different product that represents the desired characteristics of Vulnerability Assessment Software.

Answer: No. The offeror should respond with a software product that meets or exceeds the minimum mandatory requirements.

796. (Page 78 | Attachment A: Technical Specifications | Section 5.1.4 | Paragraphs C and C.1) In regards to the minimum specification for the Interactive Whiteboard, the "4 color pens" with a sub request (5.1.4.c.1) of "automatic detection of pen in use", we respectfully request the government to consider changing these requirements as market research suggests this is restrictive to only one manufacturer - SMART Technologies. To further diversify product offerings for the federal government, we suggest the removal of the specific requirement or modification to include electronic selection or setting of the pen color by way of the Interactive board's software or other functionality.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the requirement has been updated to clarify that electronic selection of multiple pen colors is acceptable.

797. (Page 78 | Attachment A: Technical Specifications | Section 5.1.4 | Paragraph C) Please expound upon the "4 color (black, blue, red and green) pens" requirement of the Interactive Whiteboard. Is this a requirement for four separate pens (i.e., one black, one blue, one red, and one green) or a requirement for one pen from which the user can select these four different colors?

Answer: See response to Question 796.

798. (Page 78 | Attachment A: Technical Specifications | Section 5.1.4 | Paragraph C) Please expound upon the Interactive Whiteboard requirement for "4 color (black, blue, red and green) pens". Should the pens be electronic or should they be ink pens?

Answer: See response to Question 796.

799. (Page 19 | Contract Terms & Conditions - Commercial Items | Section A.1.19 Technology Refreshment) The Government provides a method to replace products offered for the minimum mandatory requirements. What is the method to replace end of life or discontinued products offered as part of the offeror's depth and breadth offering?

Answer: As described in Section A.1.19, the technology refreshment process is used for refreshing all aspects of the product offerings.

800. (Pages 84-85 | Attachment A: Technical Specifications | Section 5.11 Support Devices Specialists | Paragraphs a. and b.) There are two support devices specialists the government is requiring for Category B, Group C; they are the Information Assurance Specialist and the Hardware Engineer. With this in mind, does the government want labor hour or firm fixed pricing to be proposed for these two specialists?

Answer: Pricing for the specialists is not part of the mandatory pricing exhibit. Offerors can provide various types of specialists and pricing schema as part of the available components.

801. (Pages 84-85 | Attachment A: Technical Specifications | Section 5.11 Support Devices Specialists | Paragraphs a. and b.) There are two support devices specialists the government is requiring for Category B, Group C; they are the Information Assurance Specialist and the Hardware Engineer. If the government wants labor hour pricing to be proposed for these two specialists, in which spreadsheet should that be provided? In what row and column of that spreadsheet should the labor hour pricing be inserted?

Answer: See response to Question 800.

802. (Pages 84-85 | Attachment A: Technical Specifications | Section 5.11 Support Devices Specialists | Paragraphs a. and b.) Given that an offeror is only proposing on Category B, Group C, are the two positions listed under 5.11 Support Devices Specialists (i.e., Information Assurance Specialist and Hardware Engineer) the only two positions an offeror can propose on? If not, does the government want labor hour or firm fixed pricing for the other positions? In which spreadsheet should those other positions be provided? In what row and column of that spreadsheet should the pricing for those positions be inserted?

Answer: See response to Question 800.

803. (Page 15 | Contract Terms & Conditions - Commercial Items | Section A.1.7 | Paragraph Service Restrictions under Product Classifications) Does the government want the pricing for all contract appropriate services (e.g., product based services such as site planning, installation, integration, and product engineering services) to be proposed in the offering? If so, should they be proposed as labor hour rates or firm fixed prices? In which spreadsheet should they be proposed? In what row and column of that spreadsheet should the pricing be inserted?

Answer: In scope services and various methodologies for pricing may be offered as part of the proposal's available components.

804. For Stand-alone license for a signage software package (6.3.2.c.9) there is a requirement for registration. Please specify what needs to be registered by means of the software product.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the requirement has been amended to remove the registration wording.

805. Would the government consider changing the verbiage in Tab 1 From: 5.a. All mandatory products are EPEAT certified 5.b. All mandatory products are Energy Star compliant To: 5.a. Where applicable, all mandatory products are EPEAT certified 5.b. Where applicable, all mandatory products are Energy Star compliant.

Answer: There is no need to add wording to the Tab. As noted in the MM exhibits, the responses in the Tab must be based on the wording in the RFP, not the abbreviated verbiage used for reference purposes only in the Tab. The RFP clearly states these requirements are mandatory where applicable.

806. For the minimum mandatory requirements, would the government consider making EPEAT certification and Energy Star compliance a desirable feature?

Answer: No.

807. Reference: A.1.47. Trade Agreements Certificate 52.225-6 (JAN 2005). Does this clause apply to, and is therefore inclusive of, a bidder's Available Components response in Volume II, Tab 3?

Answer: Yes.

808. The RFP document lists FARs, where some are checked and some are not, in II. CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT STATUTES OR EXECUTIVE ORDERS-- COMMERCIAL ITEMS (52.212-5) (AUG 2013)- beginning page 43. In addition to the checked FARs included in the Contract Terms and Conditions, for the bid response are offerors also required to respond to the FARs that are either referenced in the RFP or included in the list but not checked?

Answer: Offerors are not required to respond to FAR clauses which are not checked. However, FAR clauses that are included by reference are applicable to the requirement and will be incorporated by reference in the Model Contract.

809. 5.2.1.1. Monochrome Laser Printers When discussing requirement e, at least 130 fonts, are we to combine included fonts with postscript fonts? This will drastically increase the number of fonts on most machines and allow a greater chance for competition.

Answer: Yes – included and postscript fonts can be combined for this requirement.

810. 5.2.1.2. High Speed Monochrome Laser Printer Request specification l. enabled card reader be changed to Desirable. We have only been able to offer this requirement via add on hardware, compliant only with printers of far greater expense. A change to desirable would allow solutions of much lower cost to be offered at a greater value to NASA.

Answer: The minimum mandatory will remain as stated. Other printer solutions may be provided through the Available Components.

811. 5.2.1.3. Color Printer Request specification k. enabled card reader be changed to Desirable. We have searched wide and deep and have found no compatible product that includes this functionality.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, this feature has been updated to desirable.

812. 5.8. POS All in One Due to POS systems incorporating many different components, sometimes from various manufacturers, that combine to form a complete solution, where does the TAA rule fall regarding the various components? An example, we are in negotiations with a manufacturer that is able to certify all of their components are manufactured in South Korea, except for one. BUT, all of the components are shipped to and assembled within the continental united states. Does this satisfy the FAR "substantial transformation" clause?

Answer: It is up to the offeror to read, interpret and certify that their equipment meets TAA compliance per FAR 25.001(c).

813. 5.6.4. Data Input Devices Request clarification of device being sought for proposal. Current specifications are unclear what is being asked for, as they appear to be components of a much larger system. From the RFP it seems to only be listing the Ethernet Communication Module and the Detectors, which would need to be added onto an already established system. Therefore we are unable to offer an acceptable bid based on an incomplete solution. Furthermore, we are finding the ability to identify TAA compliant solutions to this requirement excessively difficult.

Answer: The requirement is for a motion detector and communication module that provides a motion detector solution.

814. Attachment A - Technical Specifications; Section 3.2.3.1. Container-based Servers - Hardware Configurations
Could the government confirm that it is acceptable to use multiple containers of different sizes and purposes that are grouped together into overall container systems for Class 3/a and Class 3/b? Similarly, is it acceptable to include only the necessary capabilities within each individual container (e.g., power and cooling containers only have needed utilities and safety equipment, and only the compute container requires raised floors and complex floor lighting)?

Answer: The offeror can meet the minimum mandatory requirements in whatever manner they wish to propose.

815. RFP Section A.4.8, PRICE EVALUATION: Please confirm that a 3-year Next Business Day onsite warranty is to be included with all minimum mandatories unless the OEM?s standard commercial warranty is different (for example, a monitor may have a 1-year advance exchange warranty).

Answer: No – the pricing exhibit is set-up to price out 36 months of warranty. The offeror should indicate how many months are included with the initial purchase of the product and the monthly cost for warranty. The pricing exhibit will then calculate the cost for 36 months of coverage.

816. Reference: II. CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT STATUTES OR EXECUTIVE ORDERS--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (52.212-5) (AUG 2013) -beginning page 43. Is it the government's intention that the referenced, and/or listed and unchecked, FARs are for post-award only?

Answer: See answer to question 808.

817. Row 42, Column A, 4.2.2.b.1.e. LTO Ent. Library: 4 TB/s transfer rate, states(from Group B, Tab 4 EMDFB) 4 TB/s transfer rate as a requirement. We are assuming there is a typo and that the government means 4 TB/hr transfer rate. Please confirm.

Answer: See response to Question 562.

818. Attachment A - Technical Specifications; Section 3.2.2.1. Requirement: f. Provide 464 Compute Nodes and 16 Compute Nodes with GPUs, where each node shall be provided with the following configuration: 5) Option for Many Integrated Core (MIC) (aka Intel Knights Corner): (a) Option for one MIC per Compute Node; (b) Two MICs per Compute Node (Desirable): (i) Full PCI bi-section bandwidth to both MICs (desirable). Question: Could the government confirm that the requirement is for one or two (two is desirable) MICs for each of the 16 Compute Nodes with GPUs, not one or two MICs for the other 464 Compute Nodes?

Answer: See response to Question 590.

819. RFP Section A.1.17, CERTIFICATE OF MAINTAINABILITY. It is our interpretation that the issuing Contracting Officer would only require a Certificate of Maintainability, 1) in those instances where the equipment?s respective warranty or extended warranty contract may have expired, or 2) for the procurement of either used or refurbished equipment for non-mandatory (available component) list as referenced in C.1.6. USED EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS. Would the Government please confirm?

Answer: The RFP does not limit what an issuing contracting officer might request. The contract requirement is that a Contracting Officer can require a Certificate of Maintainability. There is nothing that restricts this to refurbished equipment. There is also no reference in this clause to

situations where the maintenance has expired. The clause refers to initial purchase of a product and to the immediate time when the current maintenance will end.

820. RFP Evaluation Criteria, Sections A.4.6.1, A.4.6.2, and A.4.6.3: Would the SEWP PMO please provide a further breakdown of how you intend to evaluate the different categories required in each of the Subfactors, 1) Excellence of Proposed Systems, 2) Offeror?s Support and Commitment, and 3) Management Plan? For example, under Excellence of Proposed Systems, what are the maximum evaluation points assigned to the individual sub-categories of Proposed Systems, Available Components, Exceeding the Minimum/Desirable Features, and Other Features?

    Answer: The Government shall evaluate the proposal responses against the evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP. There are no maximum evaluation points assigned to elements of the individual Subfactors.

821. Is LTO-5 media required to be included for compliance to requirement 4.2.2.b.1.c?

    Answer: No.

822. Is LTO-6 media required to be included for compliance to requirement 4.2.2.b.1.d?

    Answer: No.

823. We are unable to find a TAA Tablet that is in current production that meets the technical specifications We recommend the specification be revised to 10.4" or less screen size.

    Answer: This requirement was previously amended.

824. For requirement 4.1.a.6 "External hard disk drive ? 40GB storage", is a third party USB-connected hard disk drive acceptable?

    Answer: See answer to question 437.

825. In the answer to question #28, NASA stated: "The mandatory containers should be based solely on the base cost of meeting the mandatory requirements listed in the section. Installation is not a part of the mandatory pricing;" Does your answer "Installation is not a part of the mandatory pricing" refers only to the physical installation of container units on a concrete pad at a Government selected site, providing power and network and plumbing to the site, and similar container installation related work. However, the statement "Installation is not a part of the mandatory pricing" does not refer to installation of servers, storage and networking in containers. And therefore we need to assume that the bidders need to integrate the hardware described in the RFP into the container - including cabling for power and network links and any required SW installation as described in the RFP section 3.2.3: The requirements stated in this section shall be proposed as a completely integrated solution that would be delivered in a container. Are both assumptions correct?

    Answer: No. Only the cost of the products need to be included in mandatory pricing.

826. We have a product we would like to offer that is EPEAT and Energy Star compliant but is not listed on the EPEAT and or Energy star Websites, Can we propose a product that is Energy Star and or Epeat compliant but not listed in the EPEAT or Energy Star Website? Can we just check the box yes? Is documentation ie certification letter from the Manufacturer required?

    Answer: If all mandatory products where the standard is applicable meet that standard, then the appropriate row in the MM exhibit should be marked with a Y. A certification letter is not required.

827. Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) The government states that an Agency Administrative Handling Fee, not to exceed 3/4% of the total price of the delivery order, shall be applied to all delivery orders. The Contractor shall be responsible for including the SEWP fee within the total amount of the quote inclusive of all costs including handling and travel costs. The fee shall not be listed separately on quotes or orders. The fee must be included within the price of the quoted offerings. Does the government want the Agency Administrative Handling Fee to be included in the price of all items (e.g., minimum mandatory, available components, etc.) proposed by an offeror? If so, what percentage for the Agency Administrative Handling fee should be used for evaluation purposes?

Answer: See response to Question 252.

828. Section A.3.15.4.1 <Classification> Worksheets) The government states that a list of available components which enhance and broaden the offeror's proposal with respect to the first two Acquisition Objectives in Attachment C shall be offered. Is it acceptable for a small business to propose to prime the SEWP V contract under Category B, Group C with the help of other team members (e.g., other VARs) whose role it is to strengthen the depth and breadth of the proposed offering? If so, is it acceptable to include additional items from team member catalogs as part of the prime's available components offering even if the prime is not the one who possesses the Original Equipment Manufacturer's authorization for those additional items but rather the team member possesses that authorization?

Answer: It is not required that the Prime be an authorized reseller for available components. After contract award, all items will need to be marked in terms of authorization as described in <u>C.1.3.7. SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT</u>

829. Attachment A - Technical Specifications; Section 3.1. Core Specifications Introduction Requirements for proposed mandatory products include: a. EPEAT certified, and b. Energy Star Compliance (where applicable). Note that these requirements also apply to Attachment A, Sections 4., 5., and 6. (for Groups B, C, and D). Comment: There is no concern with meeting the EPEAT and Energy Star compliance requirements during SEWP TRs and for individual quotes/orders. However, the specific product categories, OEMs, and products that are listed for compliance under the EPEAT and Energy Star programs are changing over time. Therefore, it is unclear how a consistent evaluation baseline of compliant products can be maintained throughout the extended timeline from industry proposals through government evaluations under this solicitation. Offerors may have different data on compliance depending on date of verification, and the government's evaluation at a later date may yield different compliance data as well. Therefore, we suggest the government remove EPEAT and Energy Star as mandatory product requirements and apply these compliance standards for post-award contract management operations only.

Answer: The requirement will remain as stated.

830. 2. Use encryption technology for communication - The current state of technology shows that IP communication modules controlling one or few detectors do not generally support encryptions as motion detection units tend to be based on simplistic I/O data. Can the Government remove the encryption requirement?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the requirement has been changed to desirable.

831. MFDs in this class often have RAM below 1GB, would the Government consider reducing the minimum amount of RAM to 256MB?

Answer: The minimum mandatory will remain as stated. Other MFDs with lower memory may be included in the Available Components.

832. The Government noted in their response to Industry Day Question #81 that non-TAA compliant Available Components must be flagged as such: 81. Q: Is TAA compliance required for Mandatory and

Available components? A: As noted in the draft RFP all mandatory items must be TAA compliant. Available components which are not TAA compliant must be flagged as such and can only be purchased if the issuing Contracting Officer determines that an exception exists as cited in the Federal Acquisition Regulations at the delivery order level. Does this mean non-TAA items are to be identified at the delivery order level, or in the proposal as part of Tab 3, Available Components? If in Tab 3 of the proposal, where and in what format shall these items be identified?

Answer: Please see response to Question 259.

833. RFP Section 3.1.4.2, Programming Environment, ?The class 1 and 2 systems shall provide: a) An ISO compliant C++ compiler (ISO/IEC 14882:2011) . . . b) an ISO compliant Fortran 2008 standard compiler (ISO/IEC 1539-1:2010)?: Our research indicates that open source and commercial compilers have very limited or experimental support for C++11 and Fortran 2008. For example, GCC (most widely used open source C++ compiler) only supports C++11 in an experimental capacity. Similarly, Fortran 2008 support is patchy, and no major distribution has fully adopted Fortran 2008 specifications. Please clarify if these are the intended compiler requirements for the mid-range and high-end clusters.

Answer: See response to Question 649.

834. In section A.3.14.5.1., Warranty Pricing for Extended Warranty, the text indicates that a 36 month warranty price will be arrived at by calculating a monthly price based on subtracting the number of months covered in the original manufacturer?s box warranty from 36 months. Then, prorating the price of the Extended Warranty by dividing the offeror?s Discounted Extended Warranty price into the resulting figure. This results in a blending of the original warranty and the extended warranty. They are two different products that have different service levels and there are different services offered under each. The 36 Month Extended Warranty from major manufacturers includes an uplift to the original warranty to allow for enhanced service levels of the standard warranty, and an additional two years of those increased service levels; for example, the Next Business Day Repair Response time is not included in a standard warranty and is only available by purchasing the extended warranty package. Because the 3-Year, next business day warranty for the mandatory items is really a separate product, would the government allow the offeror to provide a discount off of the extended warranty price and remove the calculation for the Adjusted 36 Month Warranty Package?

Answer: No. The offeror should indicate the number of months that the warranty that is included in the initial purchase of the product meets the requirements in section A.3.14.5.1. If the included warranty does not meet the requirement, then a 0 (zero) should be placed as the number of months. The offeror must then provide a warranty package that meets the requirements of section A.3.14.5.1 and place the monthly price in the appropriate row of the pricing exhibit. Therefore if it is necessary to buy a separate warranty package at the time of purchase in order to meet those requirements, the monthly price will be multiplied by 36.

835. 3.1.4.2. Programming Environment, "a. An ISO compliant C++ compiler (ISO/IEC 14882:2011) ..." Neither open source nor most commercial compilers fully support the new C++11 standard. Most provide experimental or limited support for a subset of the new features. Would a solution that includes limited support for C++11 be considered compliant?

Answer: See response to Question 649.

836. 3.1.4.2. Programming Environment, "b. an ISO compliant Fortran 2008 standard compiler (ISO/IEC 1539-1:2010) . . ." Neither open source nor most commercial compilers fully support the Fortran 2008 standard. Would a solution that includes limited support for Fortran 2008 be considered compliant?

Answer: See response to Question 649.

837. Attachment A - Technical Specifications; A.3.2.1.1. Hardware Configuration Specification 3.2.1.1.d.4.a requires a minimum of 36 Terabytes of storage. Question 57 from "SEWP V RFP Questions and

Answers 1" document posted 9/04/13 also referenced this requirement, and the government's response indicated that "The line item pricing for the drive should be the price of one 36TB drive." Note: Similar data storage requirements are also found in 3.2.1.1.e.3.i. and 3.2.2.1.f.7. Question: Our research indicates that there are no commercially available hard drives with 36 TB capacity. Please confirm that a combination of commercially available drives, equal to or greater than 36 TB, will be acceptable.

Answer: See Revised Answer to Question 57 in Q and A Set #2.

838. Evaluation Criteria, RFP Section A.4.6: To ensure offerors are meeting the SEWP PMO's needs and requirements, would you please provide additional clarification as to the subjective factors of the evaluation criteria for each of the required Subfactors, 1) Excellence of Proposed Systems, 2) Offeror?s Support and Commitment, and 3) Management Plan. For example, under Management Plan what is NASA's defined method for evaluating the offeror's submission as it relates to overall "effectiveness, thoroughness, and understanding, to provide the SEWP Program Office and the Government customer with an integrated approach to acquisition program management"?

Answer: The Government does not have any additional detail or defined methods of evaluation, other than the information that has already been included in the solicitation's evaluation criteria.

839. Are three-ring binders required for the hard copies or are spiral bindings acceptable?

Answer: Either are acceptable.

840. Section A.3.8 states that the offer volume will include four original signed SF 1449s. Does each of the four hard copies need to contain four signed SF1449s or is this only a requirement for the original copy of this volume?

Answer: See answer to question 251.

841. Regarding the model contract request on A.3.8, are you only requesting that we return parts I and II of the RFP as they currently exist since our exceptions would be captured later in this volume.

Answer: See answer to question 249.

842. Does the Offer Volume require any tabs?

Answer: See answer to questions 224.

843. Regarding section C.1.3.1.1, Is the Government Access Standards compliance of our web site required at the time of RFP submission or will a commitment to have it completed by a future date after award be acceptable?

Answer: The offeror should discuss how they meet C.1.3.1.1. in Tab 8 under Data Interchange.

844. Regarding the information concerning responsibility requested in A.3.8, which portions of FAR 9.104 are applicable to this opportunity? Is it primarily 9.104-1 and 9.104-2?

Answer: See Section A.4.4 of the RFP and FAR 9.104-1 and 9.104-2. Other than the Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan (For all Other-Than-Small Offerors), there are no special submission requirements.

845. Would you please clarify what elements of the proposal the VPAT is required for? Is this only for the mandatory products in our group?

Answer: See <u>A.3.11.1. Instructions for TAB 1;</u> 1.5.1. Section 508 Information; and .1.8.2. Manufacturer's 508 Compliance.

846. Do you have an approximated breakdown of spend on this contract by state/NASA location? What are the primary locations which would be served?

Answer: The SEWP contracts are utilized by every Federal Agency throughout the world.

847. Do the contracts requested as part of our response to A.3.13 (past performance volume) have to be government contracts? Or may they be references from large companies?

Answer: See answer to question 718.

848. Do you require that the program office for this contract be based in a particular location? Is there a preference for an office in particular region?

Answer: No, there is no stated preference.

849. 5.5.1.b. Small Tablet: optional keyboard
Manufacturer does not offer a TAA compliant keyboard. Will there be an exception given for this item to offer a non-TAA compliant keyboard?

Answer: See response to Question 242.

850. There are several items that manufacturers are unable to meet the minimum mandatory requirements. Will there be exceptions given? Several examples of these parts are: 5.5.1.g.3. Small tablet: 4g (desirable); 5.4.2.c. Large scanner: 2 mm thick originals; 5.4.2.c.1. Large Scanner: 12 mm originals (desirable).

Answer: There is no exception to minimum mandatories. Note that desirable features are by definition not mandatory but can only be offered as part of the mandatory offering if all mandatory requirements are met.

851. 5.9.2.1.h. Color MFP: SMTP and POP
Manufacturers are offering SMTP only. POP is only used for devices that receive emails. Will an exception be given to offer only SMTP?

Answer: See answer to question 315.

852. Tab 3: Product Classifications Tab-Can an offeror add more classification subgroups as new products are offered?

Answer: No.

853. A.3.15.4.1

RFP Section A.3.15.1 states "the Proposed Discount % must match or be greater than the associated Discount in the Product Classification Worksheet". Furthermore, the comment in Cell H4 in each Classification Worksheet in the Pricing Exhibit states: "The discount in Column H [Classification Subgroup Discount] must be equal to the corresponding Input-Output Device subgroup proposed in the Product Classifications worksheet".

Should all Classification Subgroup Discounts "equal" each to, or must match, or be greater than the associated Discount in the Product Classification Worksheet?

Answer: See response to question 281.

854. The Product Classification Tab within the Pricing Exhibit for Group D has a comment that instructs the offeror to enter a percentage discount for each Classification Description Subgroup. The sheet is locked; please provide an updated version that is unlocked
.
Answer: Only portions of the sheet are locked. Offerors can add to the blank cells in columns B and C and can also insert more rows as needed.

855. In Amendment 0003 provided 9/4 (attached), there appears to be a contradiction with regard to Tab 5: Questions 16 and 21 (of the "Questions and Answers" pdf) indicate that the 508/VPAT information is to be provided in Tab 1, NOT Tab 5; however, the requirements for Tab 5 in "Amendment 3" indicates that the 508/VAPT information is to be provided there. Please advise.

Answer: The RFP has been amended to indicate 508 documentation for the mandatory items is only required in Tab 1. Note, however that TAB 5 instructions discuss the type of information to be provided concerning overall support for assistive technology.

856. In order to provide offerors with a single source for determining the current SEWP V solicitation requirements, would the government please release a set of revised RFP documentation that incorporates all amendments and answers to questions provided to date?

Answer: Amendment 6 incorporates all amendments. All remaining questions submitted prior to September 16, 2013 is released in this document Q&A set #3.

857. The government removed the words "or greater" from the pricing readme, thereby requiring that offerors bid each available component item at a discount equal to the associated subcategory discount. Post award, will SEWP V contract holders be required to add new items to contract at a discount equal to (not less than and not greater than) the associated subcategory discount for that item?
Answer: As noted in the RFP, the requirement to match the proposed discount is effective only for the proposal. Subpoints 3) and 4) inSection A.3.15.4. Product Classification Worksheet have been amended to clarify that during proposal, the discount for all proposed items must match the proposed discount for their subcategory. Subpart 5) addresses post-award technology refreshments and states that the "Proposed Discount % must match or be greater than the associated Discount in the Product Classification Worksheet. "

 Answer: See response to question 281.

858. The government removed the words "or greater" from the pricing readme, thereby requiring that offerors bid each available component item at a discount equal to the associated subcategory discount. Post award, will SEWP V contract holders be able to add items at discounts greater than or equal to the subcategory discount for that item?

Answer: See response to question 281.

859. A.3.12.1 Excellence of Proposed Systems (Subfactor A) If an offeror proposes an item with a viewable screen size that is greater than 7 inches (e.g. 10.2 inches), would the government consider the proposed item to exceed this minimum requirement?

Answer: This requirement was removed from the minimum mandatories.

860. 5.5.1. Small format Tablet
If an offeror proposes an item with a viewable screen size that is less than 7 inches (e.g. 6.7 inches), would the government consider the proposed item to exceed this minimum requirement?

Answer: This requirement was removed from the minimum mandatories.

861. Are small businesses that are above the 150 person NAICS Code limit required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan?

Answer: NAICS Code 541519 has a size standard of 150 employees. If an Offeror providing a proposal for a group under this NAICS Code has more than 150 employees, the offeror is considered "other than small" and must submit a commercial small business subcontracting plan as required in A.1.45.

862. Can a SDVOSB just over the 150 person NAICS Code size limit still have agency credit as a SDVOSB when bidding full and open categories?

Answer: No.

863. Can an agency elect to use a different NAICS Code with a higher SDVOSB size limitation to receive small business credit?

Answer: No, the NAICS codes and size standards will remain as stated in the RFP.

864. Can a vendor claim to be able to provide a "Desirable" capability in the EMDFA spreadsheet without actually including the extra capability in the priced configuration? The "Desirable" capability is or would be available to a customer who wants it when the SEWP V customer issues a specific purchase order off the contract with the "Desirable" capability explicitly requested or stated in the PO.

Answer: No.

865. Section 5.1.1. LCD Display Monitor, "b. 21 inch viewable screen (diagonal)": Will a 21.5 inch viewable screen be acceptable?

Answer: Yes.

866. 3.2.3.1.a. - Is 100% free-air cooling (open loop) acceptable?

Answer: A 100% free-air cooling solution can be proposed as long as the offeror includes the necessary equipment to remove the heat generated by the cluster. Offerors must rely on the existing cooling solution within the data center for only a small amount of residual heat (less than 5%) that is not removed by the proposed solution and humidity control.

867. 3.2.3.1. - Environmental conditions, ". . . there are no extreme environmental conditions to be considered": Can NASA provide more clarity in terms of temperature and humidity range other than not extreme?

Answer: An ideal environment should be assumed.

868. 3.2.3.1.b. ? Is the power feed to each rack required to be redundant or single feed?

 Answer: Any power feed that meets the stated minimum requirements may be proposed.

869. 3.2.3.1.b ? How much UPS (amount of power) is required? Is this UPS for one feed or is UPS required for two feeds?

Answer: Any UPS solution that meets the stated minimum requirements may be proposed.

870. Attachment A - Technical Specifications; Section 3.2.1.1.d.1. Requirement is for: (1) Dual Socket Motherboards; i. Oct-Core Intel "SandyBridge" 2.3GHz processors 1. Oct-Core Intel "SandyBridge" 2.5GHz processor (desirable) Reference: Question 9 from "SEWP V DRFP Questions and Answers 7" released 5/13/13 addressed this requirement for the similar specification in 3.2.2.1.d.2.a., and the government's response indicated that "The next generation Intel CPU would meet the desirable feature." Question: Our research indicates that the "Ivy Bridge" next generation Intel processor is completely swappable, backwards compatible, faster, more power efficient, and with other enhancements over the Sandy Bridge. Since the wording for the Dual Socket Motherboard requirement is different for Classes 1 and 2 (Class 1 does not list "Next Generation Socket Compatible (Desirable)", could the government confirm that the Ivy Bridge next generation processor would also be a desirable item for Class 1?

Answer: No. Next Generation Socket compatibility is not a desirable for Class 1

871. 3.2.3.1.o - For remote management capability, what is needed to be controlled remotely and is there a preferred management software or protocol?

Answer: Basic functionality meeting the stated requirements must be proposed.

872. 3.2.3.1.2.a. - Is it acceptable if the racks are more than 42U in height?

Answer: Yes, as long as the racks fit within the proposed solution.

873. 2.STK T9840D - The StorageTek STK9840D can only be met by one OEM, Oracle. NASA has not provided the necessary Justification and Approval for this Oracle drive. Will the Government please add "or equivalent" to the STK T9840D requirement?

Answer: See response to Question 112.

874. 2.STK T9840D - Oracle has discontinued the STK T9840D drive with no replacement as of 12/01/2013, and media is no longer available. Will the Government please remove this requirement as it won't be available after contract award?

Answer: See response to Question 112.

875. 3.STK T10000C - The StorageTek STK T10000C can only be met by one OEM, Oracle. NASA has not provided the necessary Justification and Approval for this Oracle drive. Will the Government please add "or equivalent" to the STK T10000C requirement?

Answer: No – this remains a mandatory requirement.

876.3.STK T10000C - The first requirement "Read compatible with STK 10000B and 10000A" can only be met by an Oracle STK T10000C Drive. NASA has not provided the necessary Justification and Approval for this Oracle drive. Can the Government remove the requirement for "Read compatible with STK 10000B and 10000A?"

Answer: No. The ability to provide this item remains a mandatory requirement. This is not for a purchase of the items – just an assurance that this item will be available from this group of contracts. A Justification and Approval document would be needed when an RFQ is released against the SEWP contracts.

877.c.Large robotic device - A portion of the seventh requirement, "Configurable to support STK T9840D/C, STK T10000C/B/A," can only be met by an Oracle Tape Library. NASA has not provided the necessary Justification and Approval for the Oracle drives STK T9840D/C, STK T10000C/B/A. Can the Government remove the requirement "Configurable to support STK T9840D/C, STK T10000C/B/A?"

Answer: The STK requirement for the large robotic device has been changed to a desirable.

878.Per question #42 from SEWP_V_RFP_Questions_and_Answers_1.pdf, and in both our research and the research of our industry partners, no technically compliant EPEAT plotter is available for 5.3.1, Color Large-Format Plotter. MMC.XLS row 5 requires a Y/N response for "5.a. All mandatory products are EPEAT certified". Will a "No" answer in response to this question create a non-compliance condition in offeror's bid? Question #47 seems to imply that "A = Applicable but no EPEAT compliant product available" is an acceptable answer, yet this is a yes/no question that applies to the entire Group C catalog. Please offer guidance.

Answer: See response to Question 366.

879.3.2.3.1.e - How is PUE determined? Is it measured from the power feed to the module, or is it measured further upstream (closer to site switchgear)?

Answer: Refer to: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Power_usage_effectiveness for a definition of PUE. The PUE is to be measured from the power feed to the container.

880. (Page 115 | Attachment C: Statement of Work | Section C.1.3.4 Electronic Processes | Point 2) under the last sentence) The government states that the Contractor shall be able to process the following electronic documents and then it lists 2 points but only details one of those two points. What is the second electronic document that the Contractor shall be able to process?

Answer: See answer to Question 349.

881.3.1 Core Specifications Introduction - Does each of the following apply to the modular solutions (class 3/a and 3/b containers)? ? EPEAT ? Energy Star ? 508 compliance. Typically customized modular containers are not subject to EPEAT or Energy Star requirements because the servers they house are not. Is the same true for 508 compliance?

Answer: The offeror can explain the applicability or non-applicability in Tab 1.

882. Section 3.2.3.1 on environmental conditions: Would a system supporting a temperature environment ranging from 10 degrees C to 35 degrees C be acceptable? Would a system supporting Relative Humidity of 10% to 80% (continuous) be acceptable?

Answer: Yes

883. Reference Proposal Deadline in Amendment 3: Considering the extensive requirements of this RFP, would NASA please extend the deadline for proposals by three weeks to November 8, 2013, or at least three weeks from the date offerors have all Questions and Answers?

Answer: Please see answer to question 261.

884. Reference 5.5.1 Small format Tablet TAA compliant. While we continue to search, we are finding that there are no longer technically compliant small format tablets that are actually TAA compliant in production. We have found that several units which appear on various GSA schedules via GSA Advantage are, on investigation with their actual manufacturers, manufactured in mainland China. We note that all the major distributors have been unable to identify a compliant product. Request that the Government verify that there is a fully compliant TAA product still in production.

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the tablet requirement has been updated.

885. Reference 5.6.1 Ergonomic Mouse and 5.6.2 Ergonomic s. While we continue to search, we are finding that there are no longer technically compliant devices that are actually TAA compliant in production. Specifically, our last TAA compliant manufacturers have moved all production to China. We have found that several units (e.g. Microsoft, Logitech, Adesso, and Fellowes) which appear on various GSA schedules via GSA Advantage are, on investigation with their actual manufacturers, all manufactured in mainland China. We note that all the major distributors have been unable to identify a compliant product. Request that the Government verify that there is a fully compliant TAA products still in production.

Answer: See response to Questions 241 and 242.

886. Does the government intend to identify a maximum dollar amount as a fee cap, such as $10,000, per invoice and/or modification?

Answer: The fee will be determined and announced after contract award.

887. Is the 3/4% a static a fee up until the cap is reached, or is the percentage a variable based on other conditions?

Answer: The ¾ percent is the highest the Government will allow the fee to be. The fee will be set significantly lower at the start of SEWP V.

888. What is the purpose of identifying woman-owned small businesses when there is no track in this procurement that is set aside for this category?

Answer: As stated in the RFP, the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 will allow issuing contracting officers to set aside delivery orders to any small business designation at the delivery order level.

889. Is it the government's intention to set aside awards for this category?

Answer: Set-asides would be handled at the delivery order level.

890. Does this clause only apply to delivery orders by and for the use of NASA or does this apply to any delivery order released under the SEWP V contract for any agency?

Answer: If the clause in question has words "APPLIES TO NASA DELIVERY ORDERS ONLY" in the heading then that clause only applies to NASA delivery orders.

891. Section 5.1.2.f. requires a maximum throw distance of 29 feet. As throw distance is variable and relative to screen size, please specify a screen size for the maximum throw distance specification.

Answer: Answer: See response to Question 245.

892. Regarding C.1.2.5. PMO Technical Services: How will the SEWP PMO determine which contractors are most appropriate to forward to ordering agencies within specific questions around technology?

Answer: The Government issuing agency makes this determination, not the SEWP PMO

893. Regarding C.1.3.2.3. Program Manager Meetings: Is a SEWP Contract Holder Relationship Manager a government employee or a contractor working in the SEWP contracting office?

Answer: The staffing for the PMO is a mixture of Government and contracting staff. There is no contract level determination of PMO staffing in this regard.

894. Regarding C.1.3.7. SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT: In the evaluation of supply chain risk, does the government interpret there to be more risk in a contractor with relationships structured under the definitions of 1.d over 1.b?

Answer: There are several documents by NIST and other entities; e.g. NIST IR 7622, that discuss risk. . Assessment of risk is done by the issuing agency at the delivery order level.

895. Regarding C.1.3.7. SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT: Please confirm that relationships identified in 1.a through 1.d inclusive are considered acceptable supply chain management processes.

Answer: See response to Question 894.

896. Regarding C.1.3.7. SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT: Please confirm that relationships identified in 1.a through 1.d inclusive are equally acceptable in terms of supply chain risk mitigation.

Answer: See response to Question 894.

897. Regarding C.1.3.7. SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT: Please confirm the government does not assess additional risk on a contractor who is a direct authorized reseller of a manufacturer, however utilizes distribution or a partner to fulfill orders?

Answer: The government may assess a higher risk for such a situation. Assessment of risk is done by the issuing agency at the delivery order level.

898. Corporations with a focus on supply chain risk management generally form contractual relationships with their OEM partners that forbid access to refurbished equipment, will the government please confirm that a company that does not offer refurbished items for the purposes of ensuring the lowest risk position associated with the supply chain will not be evaluated less favorably from a breadth and depth perspective.

Answer: The evaluation criteria for Available Components is in A.4.6.1. Excellence of Proposed Systems (Subfactor A).

899. What should the expectation be in the terms of timing for processing TRs and adds after submission assuming a complete and accurate submission of "in scope" offerings?

Answer: The Government reviews all submissions within one business day.

900. In Section III a), it states that the small business size standard for a business which does not manufacturer the product itself is 500 employees, however on the SF1449 the size standard is 1,000 employees. Please confirm the size standard for NAICS 334111 for a small business is 500 employees.

Answer: NAICS Code 334111 is a manufacturer code with a size standard of 1,000 employees as stated in Block 10 on the SF 1449.

901. How many strengths, or significant strengths, are required to achieve the highest score in each category?

Answer: There is no pre-determined number of strengths and/or significant strengths needed to achieve the highest possible score. See NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305.

902. Is cost realism based on the actual price on items offered in the pricing volume or is it the apparent cost of resources and infrastructure required to run the program to satisfy the requirements in the RFP?

Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, the sentence in question has been removed from the RFP.

903. Offeror recommends changing the 6.1.4.3.1.d. requirement to state "Frame Relay" instead of "Frame Relay Protocol [ANSI T1.606 with LMI Extensions]" since vendors no longer annotate the T1.606 standard (from 1990) in their documentation.

Answer: This requirement has been amended to be a desirable feature and reference to ANSI removed.

904. Specification reads: Scalable to support at least 25,000 simultaneous users. Minimum Mandatory spreadsheet MMD states 6.1.6.3: 25,000 users. We are not clear if are to propose a configuration that can scale to 25,000 users or one which includes all the hardware and licenses to support a minimum of 25,000 users.

Answer: See response to Question 697.

905. Specification in Attachment A delineates required number of ports. Specification in MMD table does not. Can you confirm that the required ports are as written in Attachment A?

Answer: As noted in the exhibit, the response should be based on the technical specifications in Attachment A: "The Vendor Response should reflect the vendor's ability to meet the full

requirements as stated in the referenced technical section. If there are any discrepancies between the text in the table and the referenced technical section, then the information in the referenced technical section takes precedence"

906. The numbering scheme in Attachment A does not match the MMD or EMDF tables.

   Answer: Upon release of Amendment 6, updates were made to the exhibits.

907. For requirement 6.1.8.a.3, does "SNMP device analysis," mean that the device must act as an SNMP server and send SNMP "GET" requests to devices running SNMP clients??

   Answer: That functionality would meet the requirement.

908. Reference Section 3, Container 3a compute and storage requirements: Must the 1.8/3.6 PB be contained within 1 single array?

   Answer: No.

909. Reference Section 3, Container 3b compute and storage requirements: Must the 0.9/1.8 PB be contained within 1 single array?

   Answer: No.

910. We have identified only 1 digital signage monitor that meets the all the specifications found at 6.3.2.c. However, this monitor was discontinued in July 2013. We recommend SEWP consider the option of revising these requirements, specifically increasing 6.3.2.c.2 "16.3mm slim bezel" to a larger size.

   Answer: See response to Question 286.

911. Please confirm the baseline required configuration for the mandatory Switch chassis in terms of port types (10/100/1000 UTP, 1000BaseSX, 1000BaseLX, 10Gigabit) and associated quantities.

   Answer: The minimum configuration and quantity is provided in the RFP.